BRITISH MUSEUM

Workers' Dreadnought

ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

Vol. VII.—No. 17. SATURDAY, JULY 17th, 1920. PRICE TWOPENCE.

A GAS EXPLOSION. By C. B. WARWICK.

Some proletarians in the North have made their fellow-citizens extremely uncomfortable, and have ignored Law, and the stuff employers call Sanity, revolted against their god-chosen leaders, and, in short, gone in for a little bit of precious "direct action."

Cottonopolis is the scene of battle; members of the Gas Workers' Union and General Workers' Union, on the one side, and their employers, on the other side, are the antagonists. The papers, all capitalist "rags," have been raving about a "Lightning Strike," and about the terrible awfulness of rank-and-file strikes initiated without the consent of either the "captains of industry," or the Union's official pals of the same.

As to the story itself, I quote, as a prelude, from the *Manchester Guardian*, July 9th:—

"The standard of life that was supposed to be good enough for gas-workers in the past was *scandalously inadequate* " . . . " nor has that standard in *these* days disappeared."

£3 6s. for a Job that Burns your Boots off.

The gas-workers themselves state their average wage to be £3 6s. per week, which is not much for "a job that burns the boots off your feet," so they desired, quite naturally, to improve matters; but, at first, they made the great mistake of trusting officials. After many grumblings, it was decided to initiate a strike ballot; this was completed on April 29th, and papers were sent out to all Union members concerned. They were returned on May 18th, and the result was announced on June 3rd.

96 per Cent Strike Ballot.

This showed that 96 per cent. of the workers were in favour of striking; their demand was for a 10s. increase on wages per week, double pay for Sunday work, and two weeks' holiday each year with full pay. June 26th was fixed for the expiry of strike notices, but it was later deferred, pending the results of a joint conference between the Union officials and the officials of the Federation of Gas Employers.

The Leaders Compromise.

When Capital and Labour fall upon one another's necks, the wage-slaves have to put up with the consequences—or kick over the traces. The Conference took place on July 6th, at Essex Hall, London, and as a result, the Trade Union officials gave way on a compromise, well-knowing the determination of the men for the full demand. The employers offered 1s. per day increase in wages, time and a half for toil on the Sabbath, and a week's holiday each year, with pay, to men employed over 12 months, under certain qualifications; and the Union officials agreed. The Gas Explosion quickly followed!

Rank and File Strike.

So indignant were the men with the whole business that on the following day, July 7th, they declared a strike, without asking if they could, at 10 o'clock in the evening. Manchester led the way; the gas-workers of Salford, Stockport, Bury, and Radcliffe followed on the 8th.

Trade Union Officials order Workers Back.

Immediately, local Union officials were on the men's track; one of them, Mr. Fleming Eccles, while admitting the long delay in negotiations with the employers, endeavoured to convince the men that their leaders had tried to state their case "clearly and persistently," and asked them to resume work until matters could be further dealt with, saying they had "violated the spirit of Trade Unionism by taking the matter into their own hands." But, the workers would not be persuaded.

Town Plunged in Darkness.

The strike has, of course, caused great inconvenience; many of the proletariat are roaming, during the evenings, in the gloaming of the candle-light, and restaurants dependent upon gas for cooking purposes have come down to sandwich menus; but, in spite of such troublesome, uncivilised disarrangements, it is not the proletariat of the city who are grumbling most (they are ready to sympathise with their fellows when the facts are presented to them); it is the bourgeoisie who do the shouting, and the bourgeois Press-hacks—editorial and otherwise.

Interviewed, a striker said:—"If the public only knew the great difficulties under which the hazardous and very unpleasant labour of gas-workers was carried on they would be assured of their sympathy," and yet, all the Press can do is to continue its eternally recurring attempts to delude the "public" and alienate all possible sympathy.

Capitalist Press Defends Trade Unions!

The *Daily Despatch* appeared on July 9th with the usual acrimonious "leader." It ran thusly:—

"Trade Unions fought hard for 'recognition.' Some of the most honoured names in Trade Union history are the names of men who fought, who shed their blood," etc., for "recognition." Oh! but now that "recognition is an open catchword"; it is immoral for ordinary Henry Dubbs to strive for things more tangible. The Yellow Press further sayeth:—

"Trade Unions, evidently, in the eyes of the insurgents, have outlived their usefulness." Splendid perspicacity! Evidently the "insurgents" have been doing a little thinking on their own. Well, says the "rag":—"Trade Union representatives may bargain with employers, they may accept the latter's offer, but here is the case of workers repudiating the offer accepted by their representatives." The terrible fact is that the gas-workers have broken the law by not informing the gas-works officials, and have overthrown the blessèd and immaculate spirit of Trade Unionism by not asking, and disobeying the desires of their Union officials. The "rag" sayeth: "By all means call a ballot, but go back to work first"; then we'll call for volunteers, otherwise blacklegs. "Don't let the majority be coerced by the minority"—else "if they succeed they will disable the whole principle of collective bargaining."

Struth! Gas-worker, thy name is Insurgent!

150 Manchester Firms Close Down.

On July 9th the strike spread to Heywood, and, from involving 2,000 men on the 8th, involved fully 5,000. In Manchester alone 150 firms closed down through the shortage of supplies in the gasometers (Manchester had two days', and Salford one day's supply). Fleming Eccles again addressed the Manchester men, and, after a three hours' meeting, was faced with their continued determination. They were unanimous in their resolve to go on with the strike; many more workers were assembled outside the meeting place, and when they heard the decision, greeted it with great enthusiasm.

Capitalism Calls for Clynes and O'Grady.

The Manchester *Evening News* expressed the general Press desire that Messrs. J. R. Clynes and O'Grady (both of whom were parties to the irritating concessions) should come amongst the gas-workers and endeavour "to persuade them to take a saner view than they have done."

Clynes Attacks Strikers.

Eventually, Grandfather Clynes, in an interview, gently chastised the Insurgents (as reported on the 10th): "*The stoppage is an act of revolt against Trade Unions which have done their level best in the men's interests. It is not a strike against the employers so much as a desertion of Trade Unionism.*" That's it! He either cannot see that Trade Unionism has outlived its usefulness, and that the workers must utilise different tactics to gain their ends, as their class-consciousness, their critical faculties, and their vision develop, or, as rebels believe, he is a place-maintainer, serving the interests of Capitalism. He goes on to explain very carefully the goodly reasons for the Union leaders' acceptance of the employers' offer, after the many conferences. He admits the employers were "unreasonable," but thinks the award not so bad, in so far as the Union officials "eventually secured the utmost amount of concessions which we thought could be extracted by any process of negotiation." That's plain enough; he and his ilk do not desire the workers to get *their* desires fulfilled except by many and lengthy "negotiations," and if they act themselves they are "deserters" and "insurgents" (worthy titles)! They are not supposed ever to get fed up with Officialism and Constitutionalism. But they do! And they have!

Communists ought to be on the spot wherever such spontaneous revolts occur, doing vital propaganda, endeavouring to communistically educate discontent.

A peculiarly interesting fact regarding the strike as far as Manchester, where it originated, is concerned, is that the employer is the Manchester Corporation, which is dominated by Labour men, so-called, and at whose head sits Tom Fox, Lord Mayor, also a Labour man, and an official in the Gas Workers' Union. Why comment upon it?

A Strike Against the Community.

The Press says: "The men set self-interest first, before the interest of the community, and argue as though they had no obligations to their neighbours." All modern strikes are denounced as strikes "against the community," "strikes with selfish motives," and few seem to see through the hollow hypocrisy. Production, under the system we all love so well, is socially carried out for the anti-social ends of the self-styled "Captains of Industry." Every part is so much inter-related with the rest, that if one section stops, the whole mechanism is disarranged. What could be accomplished by striking if no one were inconvenienced thereby? No one would bother about the strikers, their demands, their slave-like conditions. The hypocrites know this as well as anyone does, but they wish to whitewash themselves, and vilify the wage-slaves in the public eyes. The strike is a good weapon because it *does* hurt, and the spontaneous strike is better than the "we will tell you

when we're going to do it" sort of strikes, because it hurts more and hurts suddenly, and helps more to demonstrate working-class power when solidarity imbues the workers, a power which if used in the General Strike would bring, not merely a wage increase for a few, or all, but create in the industrial world right and ripe conditions for full proletarian control.

Consciousness does not come to all at once, however, and here we have to recall that several towns have accepted the award "under protest." Into this category came (on the 10th) Birkenhead, Bolton, Preston and Birmingham, but the strike had spread to Stoke, Burslem, Fenton (in the Potteries), Oldham, Huddersfield, and Bristol. Wigan men came out on the 9th, but were induced by the Gas Committee to return for a week, on the understanding that they (the Gas Company), admitting the men's full demand was justified, would press that view in the meantime. Bradford is still an officialistic stronghold; the men there have accepted the award unanimously. It should be clearly understood that the strike affects many other smaller towns in the strike areas, which owe their gas supplies to the places mentioned.

Up to the time of writing this for the *Dreadnought* (July 12th) nothing further has occurred, beyond Rochdale "joining up," and the Potteries-men returning for a week for more "negotiations." Manchester men know what they are up against. One strike orator said they had come to recognise the truth of the maxim: "Talk, and your leaders talk with you; fight, and you fight alone."

Clynes has wired the men to regard their strike as a "protest under provocation"; and pleads that they should return to work so that their "representatives" can continue "negotiations." The Federation of Gas Employers decided that before negotiations could be opened the men *must* return to work on the *advice* of their "leaders." That is the position at the time of going to Press. Whatever the outcome may be (*and it is not in the interests of either the Union officials or the employers that Direct Action and an unofficial strike should be allowed to succeed*) it remains as a splendid example of the awakening of self-reliance and rebellious consciousness, and a healthy distrust of officialism, amongst the workers.

IN OUR NEXT ISSUES:—

Solidarity, by Rosa Bloch, of Zurich.

Some Thoughts on Tactics, by Ness Edwards.

Capitalism and the Rapids of Revolution, by J. P. M. Millar.

Rustic Revolt, by C. B. Warwick.

The Value of the Miners' Organisation. A reply to A. J. Cook, by "Left Wing."

Constitution of the Russian Metal Workers' Industrial Union.

The German Communist Workers' Party.

Anti-Parliamentary Communists Form New Organisation.

Dear Comrades,—For almost a year the radical groups of the German Communist Party, in a combat which has been thrust upon them, have endeavoured to keep their place within the party, and to save the unity of the K.P.D. (Communist Party of Germany). During these discussions the Central Committee (Reichszentrale) of the K.P.D. tried to rid itself of the opposition. The Central Committee seized upon differences of opinion, concerning tactical questions, particularly that of Parliamentarism, as a pretext for excluding the opponents. Even after this exclusion the opposition tried several times to restore the unity of the K.P.D., which had been almost destroyed by the efforts of the Central Committee to split the party.

The attempts at unity failed, and the Opposition had no other means of uniting the various Communist organisations which were fighting against the Central Committee, than to found a new party, the "Kommunistische Arbeiter-Partei Deutschlands," K.A.P.D. (Communist Labour Party of Germany). Thus the territory is prepared, on which the Communist-revolutionary advance guards of the German proletariat is able to join.

The ancient K.P.D. was no longer apt to step forward as guide in the combat of the proletariat, since some persons, claiming the places of leaders, had profited by the proletarian solidarity to get their opinions on political questions declared essential dogmas, though their thinking is always reformist, not revolutionary, and they are afraid of any action. All the organisations and comrades, who did not acknowledge the authority of these leaders, were excluded from the party. Some of the most important organisations of the K.P.D., and, we can say, the most active ones, those who are always ready to sacrifice, must acknowledge that the K.P.D., instead of driving forward the movement of the proletariat, spent its force in fighting against persons and persecuting comrades who thought otherwise than they on tactical questions; in the confusion, produced by these struggles, all real tasks were neglected.

Organisation of Luxemburg and Liebknecht joins the New Party.

To the organisations, which in consequence of these facts separated themselves from the Central Committee, belongs also the Berlin organisation, in which Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg worked, and which still to-day holds them in deepest respect. Only in considering all these circumstances, will it be possible to judge the situation, in which the foundation of the Communist Labour Party of Germany (K.A.P.D.) took place at Easter of this year.

Therefore the foundation of the K.A.P.D. is not to be regarded as a separation or division of the Communist movement; it was unavoidable in order to overcome the state of paralysis to which this movement had come.

German Revolution Only Beginning.

The K.A.P.D. knows very well, that the great German revolution is only in the beginning; but, regarding the economic circumstances, the resolute will to the class struggle and the readiness for every sacrifice, which live in the German proletariat, it refuses decisively as a historical lie the idea that this proletarian revolution *has* been reduced, notwithstanding all efforts, to the stagnation of the pre-revolutionary state.

New Party Rejects Pre-Revolutionary Tactics.

Therefore the K.A.P.D. rejects in Germany all the methods of struggle, as, for instance, parliamentarism, that descend from the pre-revolutionary period and that are apt to confuse the front of the proletarian combatants in the time of the decisive struggle. The K.A.P.D. expects everything of the resolute war of the classes, the aim of which is the dictatorship of the proletariat, and places itself according to the doctrine of Karl Marx in the foremost front of this struggle.

Workshop Committees.

As to the economic combat of the proletariat, the K.A.P.T. fights for the "Betriebsorganisation," that is to say, *the organisation of the workers in the workshop.*

The traditional bourgeois horizon of the German trade unions causes even comrades of an oppositional political character, as soon as they succeed to any leading place in the trade union, to compromise with tendencies that are objectively anti-revolutionary. Thus it was during the war, during the revolution, and finally in the days of the Kapp-Putsch, when in the general strike, the trade unions became traitors of the proletariat.

The conduct of the K.A.P.D. has conquered the confidence of the revolutionary proletariat. Even to-day, after months of unceasing persecution and calumniation of our party, though during all this time we had no means of subsistence, the greater part of the districts of the German Communistic-revolutionary proletariat is united in the K.A.P.D. We deliver to you, dear comrades, a survey upon the growth of the K.A.P.D.

In the same degree, in which the growth of the K.A.P.D. increases, there increase also the attempts of our adversary to make impossible for us to take up the relations with the international proletarian movement by spreading false rumours amongst the foreign comrades. Particularly the report is spread that the K.A.P.D. is a "National-Bolshevist" party, and had treated with the officers of Kapp and Lüttwitz. The authors of this calumny have not been able to bring the least proof of their assertion that organisations belonging to the K.A.P.D. had begun to treat with the putsch-officers. We have been able to reveal all the tricks used to hide the beginning of this unscrupulous calumny. After several months, an effort was made to establish the calumny by "documents," but we immediately proved these "documents" to be false fabrications by the "anti-Bolshevists."

The second assertion that the K.A.P.D. is a national-Bolshevist party has its origin in the fact that two members of the Hamburg organisation, Wolffheim and Dr. Lauffenberg, have stated a theory that is not national-Bolshevistic in the proper sense of the word (that is to say, Bolshevistic, but keeping a national base), but does not exclude completely an interpretation in this direction. But these two persons, though they have some influence in their organisations, are of no importance for the whole K.A.P.D. The Party must not be charged with this theory, as, after discussion in the several organisations, the Central Committee of the K.A.P.D. has declared with nineteen against two voices, that this theory is contrary to the idea of scientific Socialism, is only a private opinion of its authors, and has nothing to do with the K.A.P.D. But the statement is not yet ended; since already almost all the district organisations of the K.A.P.D. have turned against the theory of Lauffenburg and Wolffheim, our next Party Conference will give a final decision on this question.

The K.A.P.D. stands, since its foundation, on the base of the Third International. Notwithstanding all the endeavours of the leaders of the K.P.D. to cut off from us all means of access to the Executive Committee of the Third International, we have succeeded in fixing up communications and giving accounts of the K.A.P.D. We may now hope that the near congress of the Third International, the resolutions of which we recognise, will formally accept our affiliation to the Third International.—With Communist greetings, COMMUNIST LABOUR PARTY OF GERMANY (K.A.P.D.).

Berlin, June 29th, 1920.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY PROGRAMME.

A Criticism.

On reading in last week's *Dreadnought* the projected programme of the "Communist Party," and seeing that it claimed to be based on the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, I was sufficiently curious to renew my acquaintance with the latter document, which I read in the S.L.P. edition with the prefaces of 1872, 1883, 1890, and the Translators' Preface of 1909.

As a result of a really careful study both of the Manifesto and of your Programme, I have been driven to the conclusion that the latter is *not* based on the former in a very important respect, neither as regards the letter nor the spirit.

I am, as may have been suspected, going to take up the last two "cardinal principles" of the programme:—

(6) Refusal to engage in Parliamentary Action.
(7) Non-affiliation to the Labour Party.

I want to ask those who drew up this Programme if they claim to base their "principles" on the tactics outlined in the Manifesto, and which, on the admission of Engels himself, become out of date as fresh circumstances arise; or on its principles—still correct (see p.. 2, Pref. 1, Com. Man.)—and the spirit in which they were drawn up.

If you base yourselves on the former, the position is already hopeless, as Political Action (of which Parliamentary Action was the only form of importance at that time) is directly and continually advocated. See p. 16: . . "conquest of political power by the proletariat"; p. 19: "the proletariat must first conquer political power, must rise to be the dominant class of the nation. . . "; p. 20: "The proletariat will use its political power to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie. . . "

On the other point: unity, for the purpose of revolutionary action, is advocated *even with bourgeois parties* (see Section IV.). The British Labour Party is doubtless not mentioned on account of its not yet having come into existence even at the time of Engels' last preface.

But I take it that this is reducing the matter to an absurdity, and that no such thing was in the minds of the promoters of your programme.

We are consequently left with principles and the spirit which inspired them, and I am very reluctantly compelled to think that my esteemed comrades of the "Communist Party" have taken the Manifesto for granted without having troubled to read it through, or having read it, must trust that no one else will do so.

Now I contend that the whole Manifesto was inspired by what I shall call "*Revolutionary* Opportunism," a spirit nowadays so pre-eminently manifested in Lenin's successful efforts for the furtherance of Communism, and which breathes from every word of his great work, "The State and Revolution."

". . They have no interests separate from the interests of the proletariat in general." (p. 15).

"They fight for the attainment of the immediate and momentary aims and interests of the working class, but in the movement of the present they also defend the future of that movement . . " (p. 38).

These passages from the Manifesto, together with the tactics suggested in Section IV. and the measures outlined at the end of Section II., and, in fact, the whole Manifesto, should make it clear that the Communist Party is not meant in principle to be separated from the proletariat in general, nor from any portion of it organised by itself in its own interests, and that no tactics tending towards the end in view should be scorned.

The Manifesto is full of Political Action—necessarily so—as Industry had not yet developed to that stage where the effectiveness of class-conscious industrial action had become apparent to the organised proletariat itself. It does not follow from this that because industrial action is now important, that all other tactics have to be cut out. Even were a weapon apparently useless, Marx or Engels were far too clear-sighted to make it a fundamental principle (which must be accepted) of their programme, that such a weapon must not be touched.

Now as regards the Labour Party, I should like to quote what it says on p. 28 about the reactionary French S.D.P.:—"In France, the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Democratic Party against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, *reserving however the right to criticise the phrases and illusions handed down by the revolutionary tradition.*"

If you say that this cannot apply to the Labour Party because it never had a revolutionary tradition, I will refer you to p. 5, Engels' 3rd Preface: "Its programme must not exclude the English Trade Unions . . "; and again, "and even the ultra-conservative Trade Unions of England had gradually come to the point at which, in 1887, the President of their congress at Swansea could say, in their name: "Continental Socialism has lost its terrors for us"; and, in addition, I would beg the reader to refer to the very last paragraph of "Value, Price and Profit."

Now what is the Labour Party but the political expression of Trade Unionism? It may be that, at the present time, it contains some bourgeois, has false leaders, but, none the less, it is a proletarian party, built up by the proletariat in its own interests.

It is not my purpose in this article to discuss the virtues or otherwise of the Labour Party, or of Parliamentary Action, but merely to show, as I believe I have done, the preposterousness of the claim of your Party to be based on the Communist Manifesto, and yet to be so contrary to it in letter and in spirit.

Every age has its own wisdom, and members of every movement have their own particular obsessions, but any Party claiming to be inspired by and based on the Communist Manifesto, must keep solid with the organised proletariat. However excellent your ideals, once you cut loose and soar away from the heavy-moving trunk of Labour, you will be no better and no more effective than any utopians ever were before you, bourgeois or otherwise. The Proletarian movement will go on its way in spite of you.—L. MADELEINE STEINERT.

OUR CASE RESTATED.

The History of Mankind is a History of Class Struggle.

The preliminary draft programme of the Communist Party, published in our issue for July 3rd, to which our correspondent refers, was preceded by the statement that it was based on the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels. This meant that the programme is based on what Engels, in 1883, declared to be the pervading and basic thought of the Manifesto, namely:—

"That in every historical epoch the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, formed the basis upon which it is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; but that this struggle has nowadays reached a stage of development in which the exploited and oppressed—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling—the bourgeoisie—without at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions, and class struggles."

In 1882 Engels further explained:—

"The burden of the Communist Manifesto was the declaration of the inevitable disappearance of the existing bourgeois property."

The Inevitable Disappearance of Bourgeois Property.

In 1890 Engels further said: "That Party which, convinced of the insufficiency of mere political changes, demanded a fundamental transformation of Society, called itself at that time (1847) Communistic. . " "Socialism on the Continent, at any rate, was a mere drawing-room pastime. Communism was the direct opposite. And as we already very clearly perceived that the emancipation of the workers must be the act of the working class itself, we could not hesitate an instant as to which name we should choose. And it has never since occurred to us to alter it."

Tactics depend on Conditions.

Our correspondent asks whether the Communist Party bases its programme on the tactics outlined in the Communist Manifesto of 1847. No one endowed with critical faculties could fail to realise that tactics are purely contemporary means, and

must be absolutely distinct from basic principles. Engels, in 1882, after stating that the first Russian edition of the Manifesto had been translated by Bakunin, the Anarchist, wrote: "The field of action of the Proletarian movement was very narrow when the Manifesto was first published."

Changes Since 1847.

Marx himself, in 1872, says:—

"The practical application of the principles will depend, as the Manifesto itself states, *everywhere and at all times*, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and for that reason no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II."

These measures include:—

(1) "Abolition of property in land and confiscation of ground rent to the State;
(2) "Heavily progressive income tax;
(3) "Abolition of inheritance.
(4) "Confiscation of the property of emigrants and rebels;
(5) "Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State;
(6) Centralisation of the means of transport;
(7) "Extension of national factories and instruments of production, cultivation, and improvements of waste land, in accordance with a general social plan;
(8) "Obligation of all to labour. Organisation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
(9) "Combination of agricultural and industrial labour, in order to remove the distinction between town and country;
(10) "Free education for all children;
(11) "Abolition of factory labour for children in its present form, and combination of education with material production, etc."

"That passage," said Marx and Engels, "would in many respects be differently worded to-day [1872]."

If after a quarter of a century Karl Marx could say that measures formerly advocated by him were antiquated, surely, after a further 48 years, and the rising of the Russian Soviet Republic, we are entitled, nay, it is our duty, to devise tactics to meet the present occasion. Surely we are acting in accordance with the spirit of the Manifesto in employing the tactics which seem to us the best tactics, even though they were not actually prescribed in those far-off days of the Communist Manifesto, provided they are genuine tactics of class struggle and do not betray the essential principles of Communism.

The measures quoted above from the Communist Manifesto would not to-day be put forward as the programme of any Communist Party, although, in the words of Marx, those or similar measures were then considered "indispensable as means of revolutionising the whole mode of production."

Had Marx not himself withdrawn them, would our correspondent, for the sake of mere fidelity to text, have insisted that they must form part of a Communist Programme in 1920.

In 1870 the two authors further said:—

"The remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (section IV.), although in principle still correct, yet *in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed.*"

Marx Said Support Revolutionary Movements.

It was with unconstitutional and revolutionary parties, such as the Chartists, who fought for political reforms by revolutionary methods at tremendous sacrifices unknown to the O.B.E.'s of the present day; with the Polish Party that caused insurrection in Cracow as a means to national freedom; with the German "bourgeoisie, whenever it acts in a revolutionary manner against the absolute monarchy, the feudal landlord and the little middle class," that Marx could see possibilities of engaging in a common fight He carefully added that the "Communists must never cease for one moment to instil into the workers the clearest possible recognition of the antagonism of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

He Did Not Suggest Affiliation.

Even then he did not suggest affiliation of the Communist Party with such bodies, and all his writings and actions show that he would have opposed it.

In this same part IV. of the Manifesto (which our correspondent absolutely mis-quotes in her statement that Marx and Engels advocated "unity" with the bourgeois parties—they did not do so), the authors state:—

"In short, the Communists everywhere support every *revolutionary* movement against the existing social and political order of things.

"In all these movements they bring the property question to the front as the fundamental question of the movement, no matter what its particular degree of development may be."

This Is the Hour of Revolution.

That was said at a time when the Communist movement was in its early infancy and the Revolution, was very far away. Now we have had the Russian Revolution, and Central Europe is in the throes of the same international Revolution, which is proceeding westward. This we may call, to quote Marx himself, the moment

"when the class struggle approaches the decisive hour."

Some of our British friends would have us at this juncture merge our struggle with bourgeois political movements. Not so Marx, for of this period he says:—

"When the decisive hour comes the process of dissolution within the ruling class, within the whole of society in fact, takes a character so violent and glaring that a small part of the ruling class cuts itself off and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands."

It is lack of revolutionary faith that prompts the desire to join big existing organisations, even at the cost of compromising principle. Those who do so cannot realise that a revolutionary party, which to-day may be small, will grow rapidly when the time is ripe for the attainment of its end.

The prophetic courage to declare this truth failed not in the breasts of Marx and Engels. "Few were the voices," said Engels in 1890, "which responded when we cried out to the world: 'Proletarians of all lands, unite,' 42 years ago, just before the first Parisian revolution, in which the Proletariat revolted in its own interests."

Definition of a Proletarian Party.

The Manifesto further says: "The Communists are no separate party distinct from other working-class parties." That sentence is immediately explained by the statement:—

"They have no interest separate from the interests of the proletariat in general."

"The Communists are only distinguished from other proletarian parties by this: that in the different national struggles of the proletarians they point out and bring to the fore the common interest of the proletariat, independent of nationality; and, again, that in the different evolutionary stages through which the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie must pass, they represent always the interests of the movement as a whole."

"The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties; organisation of the proletariat on a class basis; overthrow of the supremacy of the bourgeoisie; conquest of political power by the proletariat."

These are the three immediate aims laid down in the manifesto as those which the Communists share with other proletarian parties.

Forerunners of the Labour Party.

As our correspondent observes, the British Labour Party could not be mentioned in the Manifesto, as it was not formed, consequently there could be no criticism of its policy by Marx; but the Manifesto, in Part III., contains a scathing exposure of Parties which had a functional activity—given the different historical period—equivalent to that of the present-day Labour Party.

"In political practice they join in all coercive measures against the working class" (and D.O.R.A. grew when Henderson, of the Labour Party and the Second International, was in the Cabinet) "and in ordinary life they stoop, in spite of all their vapoury phrases, to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to barter truth, love and honour for the traffic in wool, beet-root, sugar and spirit." (And so they joined the vast army of Under-Secretaries, Privy Councillors, Permanent State Officials, and O.B.E.'s.)

The Executive of the Labour Party, in spite of the work of penetration "accomplished" by the B.S.P., is manned by persons to whom the words of the Manifesto against "middle-class Socialists" of, forsooth, three-quarters of a century ago, may to-day aptly be applied: "Their positive aim is to re-establish the old means of production and exchange, and with them the old property relation and the old form of society, cramping the modern means of production and exchange within the framework of the old property relation which have been shattered by those means, as they were bound to be."

Thus we find Mrs. Philip Snowden and T. C. Cramp, both supposed to belong to the Left Wing of the Labour Party, moving a resolution at a Labour Party Conference demanding the maintenance of the Supreme Economic Council of the Allies. We also find "Hands off Russia" advocated, not for the defence of Socialism, but for the re-establishment of the capitalist economic system of Central Europe, and we also find the Labour Party advocating an Allied Loan for the same purpose. And we have the cry for the re-establishment of Trade Union rules to maintain the position of Labour as it was in pre-war days and the opposition of Labour Leaders to the political strike, lest it destroy the fabric of Capitalist Society.

In the same Executive, representative of the atmosphere pervading the Labour Party, we also find the precise mentality of those "true Socialists" of Germany, again of 75 years ago, who "took their school-boy tasks so seriously, and defended, instead of the interests of the Proletarians, the interests of human nature, of mankind in general." Ramsay Macdonald, and a long list of I.L.P.-ers to-day boast of holding these views.

Again, there are those by Marx styled "conservative or bourgeois Socialists," a motley variety of reformers of every description. Where but amongst these shall be placed Webb, who induced the Labour Party to accept, as vital measures for the liberation of the workers from the slavery of capitalism, resolutions advocating the central production of electrical power, and a reformed House of Lords, and who speaks of war aims, enquires into war responsibilities, and deals with Territorial questions without reference to the class war? Where but amongst these shall we put all the slavish advocates of the League of Nations, and adorers of President Wilson, and supporters of the League of Nations' Labour Charter?

To Webb and his colleagues in the Labour Party this quotation from the Manifesto applies most aptly:

"By changes in the material conditions of life these people by no means refer to a change in bourgeois relations of production *for which a revolution is necessary*, but to administrative reforms carried out on the basis of these relations of production, thus leaving unaltered the relations of capital and wage labour, *and at the best merely lessening the cost of government for the bourgeoisie, and simplifying its administrative work.*"

Marx never for a moment suggested co-operating with any such parties.

The Inevitable Failure of the Labour Party.

Our correspondent says: "The Labour Party is the political expression of the Trade Unions . . . a proletarian party built up by the proletariat in its own interests."

We must reply that it is not a proletarian party as defined by Marx and Engels, because, in practice, its aims are not

"the organisation of the proletariat on a class basis; the overthrow of the supremacy of the bourgeoisie; the conquest of political power by the proletariat."

Our correspondent says that the Labour Party is the political expression of the Trade Unions. This statement is doubly vitiated:

Firstly, the members of the Trade Unions are in a large measure politically unawakened, and the rules of the existing Trade Unions do not permit the rank and file to dictate the political policy of the executive.

Secondly, the Trade Union basis is a narrow basis of craft, which develops antagonisms within the working class, rather than class-conscious solidarity. Marx said: "The organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually hampered by the competition amongst the workers themselves." For instance, when on the railways there is a distinct cleavage between the engine-drivers and stokers, and the other workers on the railway; when in the cotton industry you have eleven distinct card and blowing-room operatives' organisations, when you have two distinct societies of carpenters and joiners; five distinct societies of clerks, and so on; when you have the interests of the workers in one industry (which is strongly organised and unified on the masters' side) dealt with by some 25 or more bitterly competing unions; then you have still a state of things, which, far from being able to produce a coherent political party, fails to provide that elementary solidarity necessary to enable the workers to hold their own against the master-class in the present industrial conditions, much less to overthrow the Capitalist State.

Trade Unions which fail to maintain the defensive in the class struggle and are incapable of taking the offensive, cannot give form to the political expression of the proletariat, for the essential quality of the political expression of the proletariat is the Revolution against Capitalism, otherwise the expression is not proletarian, but is that of the bourgeoisie. In other words, any political party originating from the workers has no reason for existence, except for the parliamentary game of chess, and soon merges or works in unison with the bourgeois parties, unless it assumes the revolutionary characteristics, implied in the name of Communists, and unmistakably recognises that, as the Communist Manifesto says:—"Society is more and more splitting up into opposing camps, in two great hostile classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat."

Not Parliament but the Soviets.

The Manifesto speaks of the conquest of political power by the proletariat, and contains throughout not a word as to Parliamentary action. In 1872, Marx and Engels, out of a riper experience, said:—"One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that the working-class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purpose."

"The modern State is but an Executive Committee for the administration of the affairs of the whole bourgeois class."

The conquest of political power can only, therefore, be achieved by the creation of new organisms consonant with proletarian needs, separated from bourgeois institutions, gradually growing in power, extending their scope, finally taking the place of the bourgeois Executive Committee: these are the Soviets.

For every new form of society, even for every incipient form of society, a new form of representation, of control, of administration, must be created. Bourgeois society, when it overcame feudalism, created Parliament as its own political expression; Communist society must evolve its own political machinery. This is no theory; in the crucial moment of the Russian Revolution, when the Kerensky domination might have stopped the development of the Russian Revolution and arrested it at the stage of a Liberal "democracy," the cry was: "All Power to the Soviets"; not only so, but the Constituent Assembly had to be dissolved, for the Constituent was a bourgeois form of popular representation and could not live side by side with the new political instruments of the proletariat, which were the Soviets.

The Labour Party, made up as it is of antiquated craft unions, trades councils, plus the opportunist I.L.P. and individual members joining on the basis of a bourgeois reform programme, can never be the parent of the Soviets, but, on the contrary, will fight against their creation, as to-day it fights the workers' committee movement.

It is a common habit when the views of Marx are under discussion to say that the opponent has taken his works for granted, without having troubled to read them, "or, having read them, has trusted that no one else will do so." This is now too old a quip to be taken seriously. The charge that it is preposterous for the Communist Party to claim that it bases its programme on the Communist Manifesto is not in any way substantiated by the feeble objections raised by our correspondent, who has failed to show that our programme diverges from the Manifesto.

(*Continued on page 5, col. 3*).

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

Published by the Communist Party.
(British Section of the Third International).
Editor: SYLVIA PANKHURST

All Matter for Publication to be Addressed to the Editor:
400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3.
TELEPHONE: EAST 1787.

Business Communications to the Manager:
Workers' Dreadnought, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.
TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 7240.

SUBSCRIPTION:

THREE MONTHS	Post Free	2/3
SIX MONTHS	" "	4/6
ONE YEAR	" "	8/6

Vol. VII., No 17. Saturday, July 17th, 1920.

CHURCHILL AND RUSSIA.

General Golovin's Revelations.

We are by no means excited about General Golovin's reveations; they tell us nothing new Every intelligent person who has studied the situation must have been aware, from the first, that the Government has been carrying on a war against Soviet Russia as unobtrusively as possible, because the people of this country have never supported this most outrageous of capitalist wars.

In fighting this war with as *little publicity as possible*, subterfuge has followed subterfuge: we were only in Russia to keep out the Germans; the Murmansk "Regional Soviet" had even sent for us, it was alleged; we were merely rescuing the Czecho-Slovaks and aiding them to leave Russia; we were sending more troops to North Russia to enable the troops that were there to retire, but really those troops were intended to make a junction with Koltchak in Siberia; we were merely evacuating refugees and mediating as peace-makers in South Russia, but actually our guns were assisting the offensive of General Wrangel. These are but some of the many pretences uttered on the Government's behalf in the House of Commons, on the platform, and in the Press. But one who gave a serious thought to the position, and read even the news telegrams in the capitalist Press, could believe these stories.

General Golovin understood, and understood rightly, that Winston Churchill was anxious that the light of publicity should not be vividly thrown on his negotiations with the Russian counter-revolution; but Golovin was altogether mistaken in imagining that Churchill was concealing his manœuvres from the Government. The Government was a party to, and an eager participant, in the whole attack on Soviet Russia; the sleepy British public was the element which Churchill did not wish too sharply to be aroused.

This has been our view throughout; we have never believed the fantastic stories about the good, peace-loving Lloyd George and the wicked ogre Churchill. We are firmly convinced that the capitalist interests on which the Government depends decreed the attack on Soviet Russia, and that the Government as a whole was fully responsible for the affair.

This view is confirmed by the attitude of the Government when the revelations of General Golovin were brought up in the House of Commons on July 5th. Bonar Law, the Leader of the House of Commons, replied for the Government and accepted on its behalf complete responsibility.

Law's observations were cynically frank. He began by saying that Churchill had informed him that Golovin's report was inaccurate, "especially as regards the actual words and expressions used." The main substance of the report is thus, by inference, tacitly admitted.

Law said that the statement that reinforcements were sent for offensive purposes when it was pretended they were to assist a withdrawal is obviously absurd, though we all know this is precisely what happened. But he admitted: "On the other hand, the policy which the Government pursued throughout last year, of aiding the anti-Bolshevik forces, is well known and has often been debated in Parliament."

Captain Benn asked: "Were the negotiations between the Secretary of State for War and General Golovin carried on with the assent of the Cabinet?" Law replied: "That is a surprising question to me. The general policy of the Government was well known, and was carried out. Of course, my right hon. friend saw many generals connected with the anti-Bolshevik forces, and I should have been very sorry if he had to inform the Cabinet of every conversation."

Captain Benn: "Are we to understand that the Cabinet gave the Secretary of State for War *carte blanche* to carry on negotiations, or were the decisions and pledges that he may have given to those generals referred to the Cabinet for approval?"

Bonar Law: "There is no question of pledges. This, as I understand, was a general connection with one of the anti-Bolshevik forces. At that time we were openly assisting those forces. Of course, my hon. friend would speak to any of them who came to give him information."

Colonel Wedgewood: "Was it not admitted by the Secretary of State for War himself that these troops were used, not for the withdrawal, but to hold out a left hand to Koltchak coming from Siberia?"

Bonar Law: "Where is the mystery and where is the secrecy? That statement was made in the House of Commons itself."

Colonel Wedgwood: "It was made afterwards."

Asked to give time to debate the question, Bonar Law answered:—

"It would not be easy to give time, but I am sure my right hon. friend [Churchill] would like nothing better than to deal with a case so easy as this."

The Speaker's refusal, on July 6th, to allow the Churchill affair to be debated as a question of urgency was, of course, arranged with the Government. The old fiction that the Speaker is an independent arbiter has long been exploded. Churchill, smiling in ostentatious unconcern, protected himself from obvious gibes by saying that he had no desire to avoid a discussion, whilst the Speaker, in response to a Cabinet decision to which Churchill was a party, obligingly took the responsibility for preventing it; but that is only a little more of the Government camouflage with which we have become so familiar.

Again, especially by the following question and answer, it was clearly revealed that Churchill has acted throughout in complete harmony with the Government:—

"May I ask the Leader of the House whether he will consider the advisability of publishing a White Paper showing which of General Golovin's statements are disputed by the Secretary of State for War?"

Bonar Law: "No. There may be something in all this, but I have not been able to see it. I have no reason whatever to suppose that my right hon. friend has been doing anything behind the backs of his colleagues."

THE GAS STRIKE.

Clynes and the "Daily Herald" stand firm by Capitalism.

Well done, rank and file gas workers; you have proved that you possess the wisdom and courage to fight. Instead of disgracing yourselves as the Trade Union Congress and Labour Party have so often done by bombast and bluff as a cloak for cowardly inaction, you have acted at once, and silently taken the risks. You have shown that you refuse to submit to trade union officials whose sense of solidarity is with the capitalist world, and not with you. We look forward to the day when you will act with even greater determination, not for a paltry increase in wages such as you now demand, but in the great struggle of all workers to overthrow the capitalist system.

J. R. Clynes has, of course, attacked the strikers, denouncing them as rebels against trade unionism, and has declared that no negotiations can take place till the workers come to heel. No one is surprised at this: Clynes has long been known as a renegade who upholds the capitalist system, and has lost all sense of unity with the working-class from which he sprang.

The *Daily Herald* has played, in this strike, a part similar to that of Clynes. Its attitude will astonish many of its readers, whose memories are short, and who are carried away by the *Herald's* many journalistic scare cries and its habitual call to action, until action shows signs of being taken, when the call is always withdrawn.

In a leading article on July 12th, the *Daily Herald* said:—

"We suggest to the strikers that they have made a very notable protest against methods of which they do not approve. We suggest to the conference and the Executive that the employers' offer should be submitted to a ballot of the workers affected *immediately on their return to work*, and that such return should not be held to prejudice any future action."

The italics are ours.

It is the old game of keeping the workers quiet lest any serious clash should endanger the present system.

So long as these be your gods and your guides, fellow-workers, you will never emancipate yourselves from the present system. You will be working for Socialism all your lives, but you never will achieve it, until you cease to place your faith in the drum as the main implement in the class struggle.

PEACE OR WAR.

Will the Allies help Poland to further War on Soviet Russia?

Deep and mysterious are the tortuous dealings of Lloyd George's diplomatists. They are fighting the battle of capitalism against Communism, and of British capitalists against other capitalists. Only that clue can guide the earnest seeker after truth, through the intricate maze of their most dishonest dealings.

"*We are considering whether to trade with you.*"

That is the bait that the British diplomatists dangle before the eyes of Soviet Russia. "Give way to us, compromise with us, and we shall provide you with the necessaries for which your people are starving." The negotiations have dragged on month after month, but at last, on July 8th, the news of which there had been rumours for many days before, came through from Christiania that the British Government had agreed to trade with Russia on the following conditions:—

(1) *An armistice equally binding on both parties.*

(2) *A declaration from both parties that they will in due time make payment for goods and services actually rendered by the other's nationals.*

(3) *The claims under* (2) *to be considered at a Peace Conference, for which, however, trade negotiations are not to be postponed.*

(4) *Each party to abstain from interference in the other's internal affairs.*

(5) *Absolute freedom of trade and communication.*

The Soviet Government's acceptance of these terms was announced through Christiania on July 8th.

But now a new rumour is beginning to make itself heard more and more insistently. The Allied capitalist Governments are planning to give further aid to Poland's war on the Soviets.

Poland is certainly doing badly in the war! Her Government could not have begun the war without the aid of Britain and the other Allies; it certainly would have surrendered long ago but for Allied support.

It seems that whilst the British Government discusses trading and an armistice with the Soviet delegates, it is assisting the Poles to attack Soviet Russia and hoping that the attack will bring about the downfall of the Soviets. As soon as there seems a prospect that the Poles may be vanquished instead of victorious, the British Government steps in to help them. It is not only Grabski, the Polish Prime Minister, with whom the British Government and its Allies have been discussing the war prospects of Poland; Marshal Foch and other Allied generals have also been called into consultation, which shows how far from peaceful the Allied intentions are.

The Allies are now negotiating on Poland's behalf with Soviet Russia. Remember that the British authorities were negotiating peace for General Wrangel whilst they saved him from the immediate risk of final defeat and assisted him to begin a new and formidable offensive.

On July 11th the Allies telegraphed from Spa to Moscow proposing an armistice between Soviet Russia and Poland provided the Poles retreat within their national boundaries, the armistice to be followed by a conference of all the Border States, including Poland, to consider terms of peace.

The Allies stated that *if the Soviet Government should refuse to conclude Peace after the Poles had retired to their own boundaries, the Allies would immediately come to the assistance of the Poles.*

Even *The Times* retorts "which boundaries?" The frontiers of the newly-created Poland never having been generally agreed to and the extent of the territories which are to form Poland being a question of acute controversy.

When the Poles and Soviet Russia were negotiating in March, Poland made the following demands :—

1. *Annulling of the partitions of Poland in which Russia participated.*
2. *Recognition of the States established on the ruins of Russia existing to-day.*
3. *Return of the State properties comprised in the Polish frontier of 1772, which ought to be restored to the Polish State.*
4. *Participation of Poland in the gold receipts of the Russian State Bank on the basis of the balance of August 5, 1914, and the restitution of the archives of the libraries.*
5. *Ratification of the treaty by representatives of the supreme body of Russian representatives.*
6. *Poland to decide the fate of the territories situated on the west of the 1772 frontiers, in accordance with the will of the populations.*

If Russia accepts the points mentioned above, peace pourparlers *will be begun.*

Poland thus, in clause 4, laid claim to territories including areas in which Poles form but a very small proportion of the population. Poland further, in clause 2, demanded the right to meddle in Russian affairs; whilst clause 4 appears to open the door to unlimited brigandage. The Soviet Government offered the Poles the following very just terms :—

1. The Polish troops to evacuate the White Ukraine, Ruthenia and Lithuania, in order that a plebiscite may be taken in those territories.
2. A local militia to be formed for the duration of the plebiscite.
3. The plebiscite commissions to be mixed, one quarter to represent Soviet Russia, and one quarter Poland.
4. Freedom of communication between the plebiscite areas and Russia and Poland.
5. All the native inhabitants of the plebiscite territories to have the right to vote.
6. Russia will demand free communications with Germany via Poland.

These terms Poland rejected, and proceeded to war. It must be understood that, in reality, it was the Allied Governments, with Britain at their head, which rejected these terms. Had they been willing for the terms to be accepted, Poland would have been compelled to do so.

Even as we write the Allied ultimatum is announced. The Red Army is not to advance within 30 miles of a boundary line running through Brest-Litovsk and Rovno to a point 30 miles south of Prezemysl.

The Red Armies are already some distance West of Rovno; that means that they must retire—under what conditions?. A retreat may be disastrous if the enemy continue the attack; it may become a rout.

The Allies state that, if the Russians advance beyond the demarcation line, the Allies will give Poland their "whole-hearted support." Such support they have given from the first, though they have not put all their resources at the disposal of the Poles. There is probably treachery in the present suggestion; this is probably an attempt to discover whether, under some pretext or other, a plausible pretext can be put up, at the least, for supporting the attacks on Russia with greater supplies of munitions; at the most for dragging the big armies of the Allied Powers to fight Communism on a gigantic scale.

The Allies further demand a peace conference in London (this city of infamous intrigues, where all the deposed reactionaries of Europe now come to hatch plots and pull strings against progress). To this conference "Soviet Russia, on the one hand," in the words of the Press accounts, "and Poland, Lithuania, Finland, and Esthonia on the other, are to be invited."

Invited by whom? By Britain, the Allies or the League of Nations? Which of these bodies will convene the conference? Whichever one it may be, Soviet Russia will be alone—one Communist nation in a den of capitalists. The findings of such a conference might easily be such that Russia could not accept them. And then?

If the Allies dare undertake it—a more vigorous prosecution of the International Civil War.

Whilst the Polish situation looks so darkly suspicious, the menace to Soviet Russia of German counter-revolutionary armies must not be overlooked. The Allies will use the German and Austrian Monarchists as tools should Poland fail.

The turbulence of the German workers is the best protection to Soviet Russia.

FROM THE FO'C'SLE.

By TOM BARKER.

The Genoa Seamen's Congress is ending. The big companies are becoming afraid of the seamen. That accounts for the second calling of the Conference. In a late issue of the *Marine Worker*, the organ of the marine transport workers in Buenos Aires, I pointed out the woeful incapacity of the representatives of the seamen who were to sit cheek by jowl with the Governmental and shipowning delegates at the big Mediterranean port. Not one of them has touched a rope or handled a shovel for at least ten years.

The Australian Government, for instance, is represented by the ignoble Guthrie, the conscriptionist, and expelled from his organisation in Australia. A bell-wether renegade politician of the worst kind. How can so-called representatives of the seamen allow themselves to mix in conference with such types? What do seamen expect from Havelock Wilson, Guthrie, Albert Thomas, Lindley, or any of their school? No more than what they have had in the past.

The British shipowners suggest a 64-hour week for seamen, and 56 for firemen and 70 for stewards, etc. The present hours are 84 for seamen per week. On American and Scandinavian ships it is 56 at sea, 46 in port. The Britishers are also about the worst paid. This eleventh-hour suggestion of a 64-hour week from the shipowners is one of their jokes. Their million pound dividends list is another. They have had a gorgeous joke for the years following 1914, thanks to the bell-wethers who run the so-called unions.

Let the marine workers, regardless of ship, nationality, or occupation, insist upon 48 hours at sea, and 36 hours in port. Even those hours are too long; but they are a gain. The companies have had any amount of consideration in the past. They have coined untold and immense fortunes, and thrown back a few sickly "missions" as a return. Plenty of Jesus, of Havelock Wilson's platitudes, and long hours, rotten food and lousy quarters. Long live the hypocritical grabbers and their "flying angels!"

The seaman's life is the rottenest, hardest, in the industrial world. He is a serf to the feudal shipping lords. He is gaoled, swindled, robbed, and flattered. Odious scriptural Huns cadge his few pence, and he is the last hope of the police officer, as well as the fountain-source of the extravagance of the magnate. And he pays his union officials wages, in many cases, to do the shipping companies' work. And if Havelock Wilson disputes that I will meet him on the public platform to argue it.

It is time for us marine workers to move. We want the Ships' Committees working. We need propaganda in ten languages. We want an industrial democracy on board ship, with our stewards and delegates. We want to determine where the ship shall go, what we shall eat, what cargo we shall carry. We are going to determine just how long we are going to be sold by our officials, and to be skinned by their friends, the Inchcapes and Company. We are hard citizens, we grimy boys from the foc's'le, and by the holy smoke, we have got a kink that WE can run the ships, and do it better than the ignorant mug-wamps who squander the products of our sweat.

Now, Havelock, you have a few days' grace to put through those new hours, or we are going to put the ships in the Port of London under a government in the foc's'le of each ship. You have had 30 years of unionising, Mr. Wilson, M.P. You've emancipated yourself, and have forgotten—if ever you knew—the taste of dry hash and salthorse. You are as familiar with a foc's'le as I am with the person who made Julius Cæsar's frock coat. You know as much about the sea as the year-old baby of the Queen of Spain. You are a back number, and your triumphs are those of wooden ship days.

The world has gone past you, and your associates at Genoa. The light is penetrating into the murkey recesses of the foc's'le, and when you are examined in the new light alongside the shipping profiteer the seamen cannot distinguish which of you is which. You are alike as twins.

Let me ask you, wonderful union geniuses, a few questions :—

What did you ever do to protect British seamen in South America?

Why havn't you set up offices in Genoa conjointly?

What good has the political levy done the seamen?

What educational work have you done?

Do your delegates ever visit ships in port?

Can you not find a better place to examine a man's union book than in front of a shipping agent?

Are you really anything more than a funeral society masquerading as an industrial union?

An early reply will oblige.

The Genoa Conference means nothing to the foc's'le, the engine-room and the stoke-hole. If it had been of any use to the men on board I should have been there myself. I could not waste the Argentina boys' money losing my character amongst such a reprehensible company.

I am for four watches on deck and four below. Let the shipping magnates work the extra watch. All in favour in the forecastle, please say "Aye."

Carried unanimously!

(*Our Case Restated.— Contined from page 3.*)

Lenin No Opportunist.

Our correspondent tries to score a point by coining the term "revolutionary opportunism," which she says "is the spirit nowadays so pre-eminently manifested in Lenin's successful efforts for the furtherance of Communism."

The entire life work of Lenin, if rightly understood, is an attempt to bring Socialist effort back to its proper revolutionary channel. He was at Kienthal and Zimmerwald whilst the British Labour Party, throughout the war, failed to give vent to a single Socialist utterance, and only joined in effective work with the Second International, when, at the close of the war, the Peace offensive had already begun; when the secret influences behind the scene found it opportune to allow the British Labour Party to meddle in foreign affairs, in order to bolster up, and be ready to modify according to the advantage of the ruling class, the fourteen Wilsonian points of defunct memory.

So far removed was Lenin from any taint of opportunism, that he split the Russian Social Democratic Party, a very much more-advanced organisation than the British Labour Party, and built up the Bolshevik Party. He refused to have anything further to do with the Second International as soon as it became completely opportunist, and formed the Third International in opposition to it, paying no heed to the false cry of "Socialist unity." He is constantly denouncing the opportunists, to whom his message, carried to Britain by Tom Shaw, has proved peculiarly disconcerting.

Communist Party Justified.

If this letter of Madeleine Steinert may be taken as representative of the B.S.P., to which she belongs, it presents a complete justification of the refusal of the W.S.F. and the newly-formed Communist Party to fuse with the B.S.P. It openly avows an opportunist policy, and echoes George Lansbury and others in their attempt to whitewash Lenin and to claim him as a fellow opportunist.

There is no such thing as revolutionary opportunism, either in Marx or in Lenin; the phrase is a contradiction in terms.

Lenin was never an opportunist—far from it—during the struggle which preceded the overthrow of the greater part of the capitalist structure in Russia, and during the fight to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. What our correspondent misnames "revolutionary opportunism," is in reality skilful and necessary manœuvring to defend the Communist Republic after the revolution, not only against the armies of the hirelings of the Allies, but also against the support nationally given by so-called Socialist Parties of Western Europe and by the British Labour Party to their respective Capitalist governments.

Let it be remembered that the British Labour Party was a part of the coalition when the British intervention in Russia began.

Whilst on the subject of opportunism, a word is not amiss as to the present peculiar position of the B.S.P. In words it has joined the Third International, but it supports the Second by its affiliation to the British Labour Party, which is the financial mainstay of this moribund International.

Our correspondent, in saying that if it "cuts loose and soars away from the heavy-moving trunk of Labour, the Communist Party will be ineffective," proves that she is not attentively watching the development of the working class, for every day that passes shows the awakening of the rank and file of the workers in open insurrection against the political bosses of the Labour Party.

Whilst the Capitalist system has been developing, the proletariat itself has also developed. Hence new tactics become both possible and necessary. Parliamentarism and the old Unionism—the fight through leaders—give way to mass action, in which every worker takes an effective hand.

The Communist Party, in drafting its provisional programme and declaring it based on the Communist Manifesto, did so with full knowledge of the importance of that historic document, and with due regard to present conditions. It is on the spirit and principles of the great Manifesto that our programme is based. The tactics we advocate are the logical conclusion of such principles. They may be distasteful to some; they may cut short budding ambitions; they may prescribe a hard and unpopular road for individual members; nevertheless, we are confident they are the tactics for achieving the emancipation of the working class.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

Labour Party and the Budget.

July 5th.—W. Graham, a Labour Member, glad to get a safe Liberal measure to talk on, protested against the tea duty, saying the Labour Party is "solid and united on at least this matter," and "yields to none in the desire to see direct taxation very largely reduced, if not entirely swept away." He added: "I belong entirely to the school which feels it is wrong and mischievous to believe that we are going to achieve any social salvation by this endless pursuit of advancing prices by increase of wages."

Tom Myers (Lab.), also spoke against the tax.

Why Wedgwood Joined the Labour Party.

Colonel Wedgwood, who is also a Labour Member now, declared that "sound economics are always preached on the Liberal Free Trade benches. He had left the Liberal Party because of the "vast hiatus" between the policy of the Liberal Party and that of the Liberal Government. He hoped the Labour Party, when it gets into power, would "avoid the sad and evil fate of the Liberal Party" and "see that the Labour Party and the Labour Government are both in favour of a reduction of indirect taxation."

Wedgwood is typical of many new recruits to the Labour Party: they are Liberals who hope the Labour Party may prove a genuine Liberal Party. That it can never be; for the days in which the old Liberalism was possible have passed away; and even if it could be a genuine Liberal Party, it would be useless to the workers: we Socialists are all agreed on that, and yet some Socialists are full of enthusiasm in supporting good fellows like Wedgwood, who are proud of their Liberal principles!

"Labour" Supports the Brewers.

July 6th.—The brewers' representatives, Reginald Blair and Colonel Gretton, rallied the Labour Members in opposition to the tax on beer. Thirty Labour Members voted with the brewers and two with the Government; one of these was W. Graham, the other Robert Young. J. R. Clynes, who always has a keen eye to votes, said that the beer tax falls unjustly on gas workers, factory, brick, chemical; building and steel workers.

O'Grady Wants to Tax the Servant Girl's Wages.

Captain O'Grady said: "On these benches we have for years been in favour of direct taxation, and, personally, I would tax even the servant girl on her wages, because then I think you would get equity and justice in these matters. . ."

"I represent a constituency in the great city of Leeds, where the great bulk of the men are iron-founders. . . These men must have beer!"

Yes! Yes! Give the man beer to keep him quiet; let him drink away his revolutionary feelings. As for the servant girl, tax her wages! She cannot make a revolution.

So this is O'Grady's idea of equity. And the *Manchester Guardian* alleges that Lenin advises British Communists to form a block with the Labour Party!

Someone suggested that miners drink champagne. Tom Myers sprang up, declaring this to be a calumny. Why? Does he think that the miners are not entitled to drink champagne with the bosses?

Bonus Shares Pay No Tax.

Wedgwood said: "Nowadays every well-regulated company does not increase its dividends, but issues either bonus shares or shares on discount, and the happy holders of the shares get income either by selling those shares or receiving the increased dividend." He wanted to know whether the Government would not tax this kind of income and thus prevent the Income Tax being evaded by such manipulations.

The Labour Party had put down an amendment to make the super-tax apply to bonus shares. The Chairman declared the amendment out of order, because it would impose a charge and bring in persons not at present taxable. This is a fate very common to Labour Party amendments.

Sir H. Craik, having opposed the super-tax, W. Graham said:—

> "We are surprised to find such doctrines coming from a representative of a Scottish constituency, because we have always believed in advanced taxation."

Graham likes to claim solidarity with the other Scottish Members; he seems to forget that, as a Labour representative, he should show his solidarity with the working class. He continued: "I want to make it perfectly clear from the point of view of the Labour Members that we fully appreciate the burdens which different sections of the community are carrying. . . ."

(Pity the poor rich!)

"We yield to none," said he, "in our admiration of the personal sacrifices which have been made by the landed classes and others during the last five years."

How Taxation Is Evaded.

Wedgwood said: "I do not like the super-tax a bit. I differ from most of my Labour colleagues in the matter." Then he went on to tell a very interesting story:—

"I think it is actually a member of this House who has invented perhaps the most skilful way of evading Income Tax that is known. . . I would not give him away for worlds. . . ."

Hon Members: "The scheme!"

"I will give you the scheme. . . You form yourself into a company. All your property becomes the property of that company; and the dividends of all the companies in which you originally had holdings are paid into this holding company. This holding company is you, but it has this advantage: that if this company pays no dividend to you, although you are the sole shareholder, you are not liable to super-tax. It is true that Income Tax is paid. All the shares which are paid into that company, of course, pay Income Tax, but that company holds the dividends and does not pay any dividends but to you. The reserves accumulate; the property in the holding company becomes daily more valuable, and when you want money, you borrow it from the company at a reasonable rate of interest. . . In that way you avoid altogether the payment of super-tax."

Chamberlain, in replying to the debate, quite ignored these revelations.

The Mines Bill.

July 5th.—The Ministry of Mines Bill was considered in Committee very late at night. F. Hall, for the Labour Party, said that the Party had asked for time to consider the Bill in view of the fact that the miners were about to discuss it in conference. The miners had always been in favour of a Ministry of Mines. This Bill, however, does not establish a Ministry but an additional secretary to an existing department. Therefore the Labour Party would record its protest by voting in favour of an amendment moved by a Tory to limit the expenditure under the Bill.

Surely the Labour Party ought to have been able to make up its mind at the outset to present a vigorous opposition to such a Bill!

Ex-Soldier Evicted.

July 6th.—Dugald Cameron, an ex-soldier, was given land for food production in Glenorchy, on the Marquess of Breadalbane's estate. The Marquess wants the land for his deer, and Cameron has now been warned off. He refuses to go, and he is likely to be imprisoned as a result.

Fermoy Disturbances.

July 6th.—Churchill said he was investigating the rioting and destruction of property by British soldiers at the Irish towns of Fermoy and Lismore. Asked whether he would make a statement when the investigation is complete, he said: "I do not know. I will see what the result of the investigation is."

A Viscount Asks for Chocolates.

The great Viscount Curzon importantly asked whether it is intended to continue the D.O.R.A. regulation prohibiting the sale of chocolates in theatres. His lady friends probably object to it. He also, perhaps, has a sweet tooth.

The Right Hon. Edward Shortt, K.C., Home Secretary, replied: "No, sir!"

Unemployment Insurance at 15/- a Week.

July 7th.—The Unemployment Insurance Bill was to give 20/- a week out-of-work benefit to men and 16/- to women; but Dr. Macnamara, who is the Government representative in charge of the Bill, now moved an amendment to reduce it to 15/- for men and 12/- for women. The excuse is that benefit may now be claimed after three days unemployment, and that this shortening of the waiting period will be costly. W. R. Smith (Lab), pointed out that the men have to pay a penny a week more in insurance, the women a halfpenny, and the employers a penny, and that increased benefits ought therefore to be paid; but the Government refused to budge. 78 Members supported the Government and 38 opposed the reduction of benefits.

General Dyer Again.

July 5th.—Correspondence between Sir M. O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu, and the India Office was given. It is all a controversy as to how much force was necessary to suppress the Indians—there is no question of ethics!

July 8th.—Sir Edward Carson pointed out that General Dyer, after being praised and promoted by his superiors for his conduct in the Punjab, was, eight months later, made a scapegoat, and dismissed and disgraced by the Government that had at first approved this action. This change of front was entirely due to the pressure of Indian direct action.

Ben Spoor's Love of Empire.

Ben Spoor, I.L.P., made a sanctimonious speech on Liberal lines. He said that in India "there is a wave of unrest, full of dangerous possibilities." He is another Social Patriot who cherishes our Empire. He said the "non-co-operation movement" (non-co-operation with the British Government) "will make reforms impossible in India if persisted in, and we can only destroy it by "doing justice to the people of India."

His idea of justice to India seems to be the Montagu-Chelmsford Bill, one of the greatest shams ever laid before Parliament.

Slavery!

1,500 indentured Chinese labourers in Samoa are to be re-indentured for two years before the issue of the Mandate to New Zealand. Their pay under the re-indenture will be less than 15/- a week.

"Not a matter for His Majesty's Government at all," said the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and added that the matter will not be submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

China Exploited.

July 7th.—Maclean (Lab), asked whether China had offered to sign the Peace Treaty provided the Council of Four would guarantee to hear China's complaint regarding Japan's evident intention to annex Shantung, and whether the four dictators refused this request.

Bonar Law: "By a decision of the Powers at the Peace Conference the proceedings cannot be divulged."

Neil Maclean complained that it was promised that after the "War to end War" there should be open agreements openly arrived at. But Maclean declares: "I am no Bolshevik!"

The War with Turkey.

July 5th.—Bonar Law said the Allies are "resisting an attack" and the naval and military support afforded by the British to the Greeks "is to be confined to what is necessary to ensure the freedom of the Straits and the fulfilment of the Peace Terms. The reinforcements despatched to Constantinople are intended solely for that purpose."

Oil.

Bonar Law admitted that the Turkish Government before the War granted the right to take all oil discovered in Mosul and Baghdad, in return for payment of a lump sum down and a royalty on oil taken, to the Turkish Petroleum Company, which, as a result of the War, has become an all-British Company, the British Government having taken the place of the "enemy" shareholders.

Royalist Counter-Revolution in Germany.

July 6th.—Colonel Wedgwood asked the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to statements that a Royalist counter-revolutionary movement is on foot to form Bavaria, Tyrol, and Salzburg into a South German Kingdom; that munitions are being smuggled into the Tyrol from Bavaria for arming the peasants; that the Governor of the Tyrol is tolerating the arming of the peasants by the counter-revolutionaries; that the headquarters of the movement are in the Hotel Andreas Hofer, in Innsbruck; and whether he will call for a Report from the representative of His Majesty's Government."

Germans to Help Poles Against Russia: Britain Supervising.

Mr. John Guest asked whether German troops are being concentrated in East Prussia to assist the Poles. "Whether General Neil Malcolm, head of the British Military Mission, at Berlin, has recently gone to Warsaw . . accompanied by German military representatives."

Bonar Law said the first statement is an unconfirmed rumour. "General Malcolm's visit was undertaken in the ordinary course for the purpose of liason with the British Military Attaché in Poland."

"The War Office has no reason to believe General Malcolm was accompanied by German military representatives."

Poland.

July 6th.—Asked what are General Neil Malcolm's instructions as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government with regard to the present situation on the Polish front, Churchill said: "No instructions on this point have been issued to General Malcolm."

Naturally; the Government's support of the Polish attack on Soviet Russia is so thoroughly understood in the Army that no special instructions regarding it were needed.

July 8th.—Bonar Law: "The Polish Government was clearly informed that if an offensive were undertaken, His Majesty's Government could accept no responsibility for it or for its consequences."

July 8th.—Bonar Law said the Polish Government has a representative in this country.

RUSSIA.

July 5th.—It came out that Strouve, General Wrangel's "Foreign Minister," is coming to London.

Hounding Down the "Hands Off Russia" Men.

Mr. Raper asked what action the Government will take regarding General Gough, Commander Grenfell and Professor Cotter for "being associated with a notorious Bolshevik agent in Helsingfors."

Bonar Law asked for the question to be postponed.

That seems to indicate that action is being prepared against these men for daring to tell the truth.

Another Truthful Man.

C. Palmer, of the *John Bull* fraternity, nevertheless, asked whether, in view of the Golovin revelations, the Army Council would cancel the severe reprimand by court-martial of Major Sherwood Kelly, V.C., who wrote to the Press protesting against the use of British troops for offensive purposes in Soviet Russia when they had gone out on the understanding that they would be used for defence alone.

Churchill said "No!"

July 7th.—America and France, Walter Long said, have naval missions attached to General Wrangel's Mission.

Caddish.

July 8th.—Asked whether Britain will assist in removing the mines laid by British ships about the entrance to Petrograd, Bonar Law answered: "The removal of these mines is not a British obligation."

Who is Sir Percy Cox?

July 8th.—Questioned regarding the future Government of Mesopotamia, Bonar Law said: "The whole question is under consideration, and will be discussed with Sir Percy Cox. . . There will not be time for discussion here."

"The handful of men who constitute the present dictatorship."—Mrs. Snowden, on Soviet Russia.

Shall the People be Disarmed?

July 8th.—Kenworthy still demands the disarming of the Irish people. The Irish Attorney-General said that 63,354 permits to possess arms have been issued in Ireland and not withdrawn.

J.H.T., of Chicago, writes to correct a statement we quoted recently from *Gale's Magazine*, that Professor Starr, of Chicago University, who declares that a plot against Mexico was planned in Paris, is in favour of intervention in Mexico. J.H.T. says Starr is opposed to intervention.

THE TRANSPORT SCANDAL.

July 5th.—The London Electric Railway Bill came up for Second Reading in the House of Commons. More light was then thrown on the jobbery going on in this matter and the curious actions of Sir Eric Geddes, the Transport Minister, so greatly praised by the *Daily Herald* and by Mr. J. H. Thomas, of the N.U.R.

This Bill is one to enable fares to be raised on the London Electric Railways. When the Bill was before the House on Second Reading it was decided to send it to a Private Bill Committee with the instruction to inquire into the financial position of the various companies to which it applies. Many members now complained that the Committee had not examined the finances. Three witnesses were called before the Committee: Lord Ashfield (Sir Albert Stanley), Sir William Plender, and Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., of the N.U.R. Clement Edwards (N.D.P.), asserted that the Committee left it to the Ministry of Transport to inquire into the finances of the company and accepted the advice of the Minister of Transport that he should fix the increased fares. The Minister of Transport also re-drafted the Bill and gave himself the right to fix the fares on these and other railways and the Committee submitted to this action.

Clement Edwards asserted that the Bill had been put forward in the first instance because an Act passed last year had deprived Sir Eric Geddes of the power to continue the Runciman subsidy, which he denounced the other day. Unable to help his railway friends by continuing the Runciman subsidy,

"He actually suggests to the Committee upstairs that they are to increase fares as a *quid pro quo* for cancelling this very agreement, this very subsidy which he denounced. . . . The right hon. gentleman, brought here at the head of a great Ministry, and supposed to have a wonderful grasp of finance, actually proposed seriously to Parliament that they shall compound for a debt of £1,000,000 from the Treasury by imposing on the poor travelling in London £4,500,000 in perpetuity. That is the proposal. . . . The Bill now before the House, except for two formal clauses, is an entirely new Bill. Even the preamble has been amended by the Ministry of Transport. During the five weeks of the adjournment the Minister of Transport sent for the promoters. It was not a question of asking the Committee to consider new Clauses, or of asking the promoters to draw up new Clauses. The Minister actually re-drafted the whole thing. . . . The promotors handed to all the opponents what they themselves called a substituted Bill . . . so that you have every simple operative Clause in the Bill embodying the principle of which the House approved on Second Reading, thrown over and substituted by the new Bill from the Minister of Transport."

Lawyers Agree.

Clement Edwards further stated that all the lawyers engaged, both to support and oppose the Bill (they have lawyers to argue these matters in such committees), acted ont he suggestion that, as the Minister would fix the fares, it would be a waste of time to go into the question of fares there."

Increased Fares Mean 4·9 Extra Dividend.

Mr. Kennedy Jones observed that Lord Ashfield had admitted that the increased fares this year will yield £6,629,000. When all increased costs have been deducted, that will leave a net balance of £2,639,000, and after deducting rentals, renewals, reserves, etc., will leave £840,00 for ordinary stocks and shares, or 4.9 per cent. on the ordinary stocks at their face value. This is on Lord Ashfield's own estimate: actually, the profit is doubtless greater.

This Bill is promoted by four companies representing a combine of seventeen companies. The controlling company is the Underground Electric Company, which has four directors, Lord Ashfield, Mr. W. A. Burton, Mr. W. M. Acworth, and Mr. H. A. Vernet, who was Paper Controller during the War. These men control the distribution of the profits and are associated with omnibus and tram companies and will pull the strings in order that 'bus and tram fares may also be raised.

Slavish Members of Parliament.

The case put up by the opponents of the Bill was by no means shaken, but the proposal to re-commit the Bill was defeated by 184 votes to 92. 21 Labour Members voted against the Bill, and James Parker, still classed as a Labour Member, voted for it.

Capitalists Direct Control of Government.

This Bill strikingly shows how capitalist interests directly control the Government, and what a mere cipher the House of Commons has become. The Members of Parliament do not resent their humiliating position because they are soulless Party hacks, and know that without the support of their Party, which is controlled by the great capitalists, they would lose their seats.

What is J. H. Thomas Doing in This.

But what has become of the *Herald* yarn about the righteous Transport Minister? And who misinformed the *Daily Herald*? Was it J. H. Thomas? And why is he supporting Sir Eric Geddes? N.U.R. members should look into this!

THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

TRAFALGAR SQUARE MEETING

On Sunday 25th July, at 3.30 p.m.

(See Next Issue for Names of Speakers).

To Welcome the Ex-Service Men Marching from Bristol.

SOUTH WALES NOTES.

Housing Bonds.

To prove that the anti-Housing Bond Campaign has not been a movement of a few agitators, the Ferndale Lodge of the S.W.M.F. decided recently to take a ballot of its members. The form of ballot paper was such that every individual could understand the issue at stake. The result of the ballot shows a growth of class-conscious intelligence that is amazing. 1,800 men signified their disapproval of the Housing Bond Scheme, whilst only 500 were prepared to support.

As readers of the *Dreadnought* are aware, one of the Councillors (unfortunately, since deceased), sponsored by the Ferndale Lodge, resigned owing to the opposition of the Lodge to the Housing Bond Scheme, and his refusal to carry out the wishes of the Lodge.

Ferndale Lodge Stops Disobedient Councillor's Pay.

The other Councillor for whom the Ferndale Lodge is financially responsible is Abel Jacob, who, apart from being a J.P., is also chairman of the Rhondda Urban District Council. This man, although paid by the workmen, refused to accept any mandate from them. Even after the ballot upon the Housing Bonds question, he declared his intention to support the scheme of loans. Action of this sort cannot be tolerated to-day in the South Wales coalfield, more especially so in a progressive lodge like the one at Ferndale, and retribution has been swift.

Two mass meetings of the men were held; one for day-shift men, and one for night-shift men: at each meeting the following resolution was carried:—

"That this, the Ferndale Lodge of the S.W.M.F., having regard to the refusal of Councillor Abel Jacob, J.P., chairman of the R.U.D.C., to carry the definite instructions of the Lodge, to oppose the system of Housing Bonds, declines to take any further financial responsibility for him as an Urban District Councillor."

Rhondda Teachers.

The Rhondda teachers are still on the warpath and are likely to be seen in action shortly. For quite a considerable period, it is known, they have been negotiating with the R.U.D.C. in an endeavour to obtain increases in wages by peaceable means.

On several occasions rupture has seemed inevitable, owing to the attitude of the Council. The autocracy of these men to the employees of the Council is disgusting in view of the fact that the majority on the Council is composed of Labour representatives who are themselves workers. The gross indignities they force upon the teachers are of such a nature that they know their own organisation, the S.W.M.F., would not tolerate them for one moment. Nevertheless, they continue, and at the last meeting the teachers had with the Council, the bogey of bankruptcy was raised to frighten the teachers.

Seeing this had apparently no effect, the Coucillors sudden realised that, after all, they were merely representatives, and stated that before they could concede the demands of the teachers they would have to return to their constituencies.

This, as the teachers point out, would be equivalent to, and only comparable with, asking the consumers of coal if an increase in wages should be granted to the miners. Such a scheme of things is preposterous, yet miners, who are miners' representatives, have the audacity to make such suggestions to another body of workers.

Councillor Jacob's position at the present time should be a warning to these individuals, and should assist them to remember that their point of view should always be that of the worker, and in the event of their being unable to carry on within the confines of the present system, their duty is to return to the workers and tell them so. In this way they would become worthy of the confidence placed in them, and would help to stimulate revolutionary thought and action.

The Blind.

The position of the blind people in the Rhondda has long been a source of regret to every humane person. Thousands of pounds have been contributed by the miners to various institutions for the blind, yet nothing has been done to alleviate the condition of the local blind. This has caused great heart-burning amongst the blind, and those individuals who have been impressed with the apparent work done for the blind by St. Dunstan's, would do well to get amongst the blind of South Wales and ask them for their opinion. These people regard St. Dunstan's not as their benefactor, but as the enemy of the blind.

Much talk is heard of a conference of the blind held at the Clothmakers' Hall, London, a few months ago, when Sir A. Pearson, on behalf of St. Dunstan's, was asked to give the receipts side of the St. Dunstan's balance sheet. This, we are told, was refused point blank, and all the conference was given was the expenditure of the institution. Rumours are abroad that millions of pounds are invested in War stock on behalf of St. Dunstan's, whilst all over the country blind people are working for ridiculously low wages or exist by begging.

Steps are being taken in South Wales to eradicate these evil conditions. A South Wales Council for the Blind is being formed, the object of which is to build workshops for those who can work, and to make comfortable the life of those who cannot. Control is to be shared equally between the blind people's organisation, other trade unions who help to support the blind, and representatives of the various institutions of the blind that will be built.

Although the scheme is not quite as democratic as some would like it to be, it cannot be denied that it indicates progress, inasmuch as the blind people, in the past, have been allowed no voice at all in the management of the own affairs.

THE BENEFITS OF THE S.W.M.F.

In my last article I showed clearly the increased activities of the S.W.M.F., especially in the direction of education. Our organisation is moving on entirely new lines, and is recognising the evolution of industry.

The S.W.M.F. is a revolutionary organisation; we are out to use all means possible to abolish capitalism. Thousands of our members still look upon the S.W.M.F. as a financial investment; hence the need for education on Communist lines.

We desire our members to understand the identity of interests between the miners of England, Scotland and Wales. We desire to foster the spirit of Internationalism.

We are only a small fraction of the working class, hence the necessity for a closer union with other organisations. Being a Communist, and therefore an industrial unionist, I advocate the strengthening of the M.F.G.B. to unite the whole of the mining industry.

Then there is the International Miners' Movement, to which we must pay far more attention than in the past. To obtain the solidarity of the workers of the world we must unite the miners nationally and internationally. That some districts are more revolutionary than others, only proves the necessity for more extensive education and propaganda. The Miners' International has been re-formed and meets in Geneva next August. I have been appointed an official delegate from the M.F.G.B. to that conference.

To quote Plekhanof, the Labour movement must become the midwife of the new society, the embryo of which the existing capitalist society carries in its womb. In this character we have to study the mechanism of birth and find out how best it can be accomplished.

Comrades, with such great issues before us, do not let us quibble over a 1s. weekly contribution to the S.W.M.F.

A. J. COOK.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE EX-SERVICEMEN.

A Bristol Development.

The International Union of Ex-Servicemen is an exceedingly active body, which is rallying to its ranks thousands of workless and disappointed ex-soldiers, who to-day are walking the streets of Bristol, animated by a growing bitterness. The "Comrades of the Great War," that fabrication of Jingo-Toryism, has outlived its brief popularity and no longer counts. The Liberal "Federation of Discharged and Demobilised Soldiers and Sailors" has also passed its waxing time and is daily losing its membership to the militant International Union.

Bristol Ex-Servicemen who had been tram conductors before the war, found themselves unemployed and saw girls on the trams in their places. They smashed the trams in an impulse of fury. But this is not typical of the Union's activities; as a rule its action is clearly directed against the Government, the employer, or the landlord. In smashing the trams, its members were acting inadvertently, also against the girls.

In the disturbances of the day, an Ex-Serviceman was arrested. In protest a bomb was thrown at the gates of the prison. The act was probably unofficial, but it was symptomatic of the feeling that is gathering around the standard raised by the organisation. In the course of one disturbance a revolver shop was broken into.

The windows of Bristol Labour Exchanges have been smashed, because the Exchanges are regarded as a sham.

Whilst a Bristol Ex-Serviceman was in Bath the landlord gave his wife and children notice to quit. They could find no other house. To induce them to leave, the landlord cut off the gas and water, then finally evicted them by force, though he had not procured an order of the Court.

The case was brought to the International Union. The Union decided to seek legal redress for the evicted family, but it also sent a party of its members to deal directly with the landlord.

Damage done to the property of other oppressive landlords had taught the authorities what to expect, and 70 policemen were on guard to protect the landlord. All night long the landlord was terrified by police whistles blowing from this direction and that and by seeing the police go rushing helter-skelter after the ex-soldiers they never succeeded in catching.

A negro earning £1 a week, with a wife and four children to maintain, was imprisoned for failure to pay 2s. 6d. a week for a child in an industrial school. The Ex-Servicemen, hearing of his case, decided to pay the fine.

Women, often bringing their children, come to the Union with all sorts of grievances. Sometimes it is a hire-purchase company which has seized their furniture because their payments are in arrears. In such cases the Union negotiates with the Company, and there is always the menace that the shop may be wrecked unless the furniture is restored.

On July 5th the Union seized an empty house and installed a war-widow and two children therein.

A "no rent" campaign has been inaugurated.

The Union is sending some of its members to march to London to get into touch with like elements there and to focuss the opinion of the people upon its rebellious discontent.

A meeting will be held in every village on the way.

The marchers will leave Bristol on July 14th and reach London on July 25th.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

Labour Party and the Budget.

July 5th.—W. Graham, a Labour Member, glad to get a safe Liberal measure to talk on, protested against the tea duty, saying the Labour Party is "solid and united on at least this matter," and "yields to none in the desire to see direct taxation very largely reduced, if not entirely swept away." He added: "I belong entirely to the school which feels it is wrong and mischievous to believe that we are going to achieve any social salvation by this endless pursuit of advancing prices by increase of wages."

Tom Myers (Lab.), also spoke against the tax.

Why Wedgwood Joined the Labour Party.

Colonel Wedgwood, who is also a Labour Member now, declared that "sound economics are always preached on the Liberal Free Trade benches. He had left the Liberal Party because of the "vast hiatus" between the policy of the Liberal Party and that of the Liberal Government. He hoped the Labour Party, when it gets into power, would "avoid the sad and evil fate of the Liberal Party" and "see that the Labour Party and the Labour Government are both in favour of a reduction of indirect taxation."

Wedgwood is typical of many new recruits to the Labour Party: they are Liberals who hope the Labour Party may prove a genuine Liberal Party. That it can never be; for the days in which the old Liberalism was possible have passed away; and even if it could be a genuine Liberal Party, it would be useless to the workers: we Socialists are all agreed on that, and yet some Socialists are full of enthusiasm in supporting good fellows like Wedgwood, who are proud of their Liberal principles!

"Labour" Supports the Brewers.

July 6th.—The brewers' representatives, Reginald Blair and Colonel Gretton, rallied the Labour Members in opposition to the tax on beer. Thirty Labour Members voted with the brewers and two with the Government; one of these was W. Graham, the other Robert Young. J. R. Clynes, who always has a keen eye to votes, said that the beer tax falls unjustly on gas workers, factory, brick, chemical; building and steel workers.

O'Grady Wants to Tax the Servant Girl's Wages.

Captain O'Grady said: "On these benches we have for years been in favour of direct taxation, and, personally, I would tax even the servant girl on her wages, because then I think you would get equity and justice in these matters. . ."

"I represent a constituency in the great city of Leeds, where the great bulk of the men are iron-founders. . . These men must have beer!"

Yes! Yes! Give the man beer to keep him quiet; let him drink away his revolutionary feelings. As for the servant girl, tax her wages! She cannot make a revolution.

So this is O'Grady's idea of equity. And the *Manchester Guardian* alleges that Lenin advises British Communists to form a block with the Labour Party!

Someone suggested that miners drink champagne. Tom Myers sprang up, declaring this to be a calumny. Why? Does he think that the miners are not entitled to drink champagne with the bosses?

Bonus Shares Pay No Tax.

Wedgwood said: "Nowadays every well-regulated company does not increase its dividends, but issues either bonus shares or shares on discount, and the happy holders of the shares get income either by selling those shares or receiving the increased dividend." He wanted to know whether the Government would not tax this kind of income and thus prevent the Income Tax being evaded by such manipulations.

The Labour Party had put down an amendment to make the super-tax apply to bonus shares. The Chairman declared the amendment out of order, because it would impose a charge and bring in persons not at present taxable. This is a fate very common to Labour Party amendments.

Sir H. Craik, having opposed the super-tax, W. Graham said:—

> "We are surprised to find such doctrines coming from a representative of a Scottish constituency, because we have always believed in advanced taxation."

Graham likes to claim solidarity with the other Scottish Members; he seems to forget that, as a Labour representative, he should show his solidarity with the working class. He continued: "I want to make it perfectly clear from the point of view of the Labour Members that we fully appreciate the burdens which different sections of the community are carrying. . . "

(Pity the poor rich!)

"We yield to none," said he, "in our admiration of the personal sacrifices which have been made by the landed classes and others during the last five years."

How Taxation Is Evaded.

Wedgwood said: "I do not like the super-tax a bit. I differ from most of my Labour colleagues in the matter." Then he went on to tell a very interesting story:—

"I think it is actually a member of this House who has invented perhaps the most skilful way of evading Income Tax that is known. . . I would not give him away for worlds. . . "

Hon Members: "The scheme!"

"I will give you the scheme. . . You form yourself into a company. All your property becomes the property of that company; and the dividends of all the companies in which you originally had holdings are paid into this holding company. This holding company is you, but it has this advantage: that if this company pays no dividend to you, although you are the sole shareholder, you are not liable to super-tax. It is true that Income Tax is paid. All the shares which are paid into that company, of course, pay Income Tax, but that company holds the dividends and does not pay any dividends but to you. The reserves accumulate; the property in the holding company becomes daily more valuable, and when you want money, you borrow it from the company at a reasonable rate of interest. . . In that way you avoid altogether the payment of super-tax."

Chamberlain, in replying to the debate, quite ignored these revelations.

The Mines Bill.

July 5th.—The Ministry of Mines Bill was considered in Committee very late at night. F. Hall, for the Labour Party, said that the Party had asked for time to consider the Bill in view of the fact that the miners were about to discuss it in conference. The miners had always been in favour of a Ministry of Mines. This Bill, however, does not establish a Ministry but an additional secretary to an existing department. Therefore the Labour Party would record its protest by voting in favour of an amendment moved by a Tory to limit the expenditure under the Bill.

Surely the Labour Party ought to have been able to make up its mind at the outset to present a vigorous opposition to such a Bill!

Ex-Soldier Evicted.

July 6th.—Dugald Cameron, an ex-soldier, was given land for food production in Glenorchy, on the Marquess of Breadalbane's estate. The Marquess wants the land for his deer, and Cameron has now been warned off. He refuses to go, and he is likely to be imprisoned as a result.

Fermoy Disturbances.

July 6th.—Churchill said he was investigating the rioting and destruction of property by British soldiers at the Irish towns of Fermoy and Lismore. Asked whether he would make a statement when the investigation is complete, he said: "I do not know. I will see what the result of the investigation is."

A Viscount Asks for Chocolates.

The great Viscount Curzon importantly asked whether it is intended to continue the D.O.R.A. regulation prohibiting the sale of chocolates in theatres. His lady friends probably object to it. He also, perhaps, has a sweet tooth.

The Right Hon. Edward Shortt, K.C., Home Secretary, replied: "No, sir!"

Unemployment Insurance at 15/- a Week.

July 7th.—The Unemployment Insurance Bill was to give 20/- a week out-of-work benefit to men and 16/- to women; but Dr. Macnamara, who is the Government representative in charge of the Bill, now moved an amendment to reduce it to 15/- for men and 12/- for women. The excuse is that benefit may now be claimed after three days unemployment, and that this shortening of the waiting period will be costly. W. R. Smith (Lab), pointed out that the men have to pay a penny a week more in insurance, the women a halfpenny, and the employers a penny, and that increased benefits ought therefore to be paid; but the Government refused to budge. 78 Members supported the Government and 38 opposed the reduction of benefits.

General Dyer Again.

July 5th.—Correspondence between Sir M. O'Dwyer, Mr. Montagu, and the India Office was given. It is all a controversy as to how much force was necessary to suppress the Indians—there is no question of ethics!

July 8th.—Sir Edward Carson pointed out that General Dyer, after being praised and promoted by his superiors for his conduct in the Punjab, was, eight months later, made a scapegoat, and dismissed and disgraced by the Government that had at first approved this action. This change of front was entirely due to the pressure of Indian direct action.

Ben Spoor's Love of Empire.

Ben Spoor, I.L.P., made a sanctimonious speech on Liberal lines. He said that in India "there is a wave of unrest, full of dangerous possibilities." He is another Social Patriot who cherishes our Empire. He said the "non-co-operation movement" (non-co-operation with the British Government) "will make reforms impossible in India if persisted in, and we can only destroy it by "doing justice to the people of India."

His idea of justice to India seems to be the Montagu-Chelmsford Bill, one of the greatest shams ever laid before Parliament.

Slavery!

1,500 indentured Chinese labourers in Samoa are to be re-indentured for two years before the issue of the Mandate to New Zealand. Their pay under the re-indenture will be less than 15/- a week.

"Not a matter for His Majesty's Government at all," said the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and added that the matter will not be submitted to the Council of the League of Nations.

China Exploited.

July 7th.—Maclean (Lab), asked whether China had offered to sign the Peace Treaty provided the Council of Four would guarantee to hear China's complaint regarding Japan's evident intention to annex Shantung, and whether the four dictators refused this request.

Bonar Law: "By a decision of the Powers at the Peace Conference the proceedings cannot be divulged."

Neil Maclean complained that it was promised that after the "War to end War" there should be open agreements openly arrived at. But Maclean declares: "I am no Bolshevik!"

The War with Turkey.

July 5th.—Bonar Law said the Allies are "resisting an attack" and the naval and military support afforded by the British to the Greeks "is to be confined to what is necessary to ensure the freedom of the Straits and the fulfilment of the Peace Terms. The reinforcements despatched to Constantinople are intended solely for that purpose."

Oil.

Bonar Law admitted that the Turkish Government before the War granted the right to take all oil discovered in Mosul and Baghdad, in return for payment of a lump sum down and a royalty on oil taken, to the Turkish Petroleum Company, which, as a result of the War, has become an all-British Company, the British Government having taken the place of the "enemy" shareholders.

Royalist Counter-Revolution in Germany.

July 6th.—Colonel Wedgwood asked the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to statements that a Royalist counter-revolutionary movement is on foot to form Bavaria, Tyrol, and Salzburg into a South German Kingdom; that munitions are being smuggled into the Tyrol from Bavaria for arming the peasants; that the Governor of the Tyrol is tolerating the arming of the peasants by the counter-revolutionaries; that the headquarters of the movement are in the Hotel Andreas Hofer, in Innsbruck; and whether he will call for a Report from the representative of His Majesty's Government."

Germans to Help Poles Against Russia: Britain Supervising.

Mr. John Guest asked whether German troops are being concentrated in East Prussia to assist the Poles. "Whether General Neil Malcolm, head of the British Military Mission, at Berlin, has recently gone to Warsaw . . accompanied by German military representatives."

Bonar Law said the first statement is an unconfirmed rumour. "General Malcolm's visit was undertaken in the ordinary course for the purpose of liason with the British Military Attaché in Poland."

"The War Office has no reason to believe General Malcolm was accompanied by German military representatives."

Poland.

July 6th.—Asked what are General Neil Malcolm's instructions as to the attitude of His Majesty's Government with regard to the present situation on the Polish front, Churchill said: "No instructions on this point have been issued to General Malcolm."

Naturally; the Government's support of the Polish attack on Soviet Russia is so thoroughly understood in the Army that no special instructions regarding it were needed.

July 8th.—Bonar Law: "The Polish Government was clearly informed that if an offensive were undertaken, His Majesty's Government could accept no responsibility for it or for its consequences."

July 8th.—Bonar Law said the Polish Government has a representative in this country.

RUSSIA.

July 5th.—It came out that Strouve, General Wrangel's "Foreign Minister," is coming to London.

Hounding Down the "Hands Off Russia" Men.

Mr. Raper asked what action the Government will take regarding General Gough, Commander Grenfell and Professor Cotter for "being associated with a notorious Bolshevik agent in Helsingfors."

Bonar Law asked for the question to be postponed.

That seems to indicate that action is being prepared against these men for daring to tell the truth.

Another Truthful Man.

C. Palmer, of the *John Bull* fraternity, nevertheless, asked whether, in view of the Golovin revelations, the Army Council would cancel the severe reprimand by court-martial of Major Sherwood Kelly, V.C., who wrote to the Press protesting against the use of British troops for offensive purposes in Soviet Russia when they had gone out on the understanding that they would be used for defence alone.

Churchill said "No!"

July 7th.—America and France, Walter Long said, have naval missions attached to General Wrangel's Mission.

Caddish.

July 8th.—Asked whether Britain will assist in removing the mines laid by British ships about the entrance to Petrograd, Bonar Law answered: "The removal of these mines is not a British obligation."

Who is Sir Percy Cox?

July 8th.—Questioned regarding the future Government of Mesopotamia, Bonar Law said: "The whole question is under consideration, and will be discussed with Sir Percy Cox. . . There will not be time for discussion here."

"The handful of men who constitute the present dictatorship."—Mrs. Snowden, on Soviet Russia.

Shall the People be Disarmed?

July 8th.—Kenworthy still demands the disarming of the Irish people. The Irish Attorney-General said that 63,354 permits to possess arms have been issued in Ireland and not withdrawn.

J.H.T., of Chicago, writes to correct a statement we quoted recently from *Gale's Magazine*, that Professor Starr, of Chicago University, who declares that a plot against Mexico was planned in Paris, is in favour of intervention in Mexico. J.H.T. says Starr is opposed to intervention.

THE TRANSPORT SCANDAL.

July 5th.—The London Electric Railway Bill came up for Second Reading in the House of Commons. More light was then thrown on the jobbery going on in this matter and the curious actions of Sir Eric Geddes, the Transport Minister, so greatly praised by the *Daily Herald* and by Mr. J. H. Thomas, of the N.U.R.

This Bill is one to enable fares to be raised on the London Electric Railways. When the Bill was before the House on Second Reading it was decided to send it to a Private Bill Committee with the instruction to inquire into the financial position of the various companies to which it applies. Many members now complained that the Committee had not examined the finances. Three witnesses were called before the Committee: Lord Ashfield (Sir Albert Stanley), Sir William Plender, and Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., of the N.U.R. Clement Edwards (N.D.P.), asserted that the Committee left it to the Ministry of Transport to inquire into the finances of the company and accepted the advice of the Minister of Transport that he should fix the increased fares. The Minister of Transport also re-drafted the Bill and gave himself the right to fix the fares on these and other railways and the Committee submitted to this action.

Clement Edwards asserted that the Bill had been put forward in the first instance because an Act passed last year had deprived Sir Eric Geddes of the power to continue the Runciman subsidy, which he denounced the other day. Unable to help his railway friends by continuing the Runciman subsidy,

"He actually suggests to the Committee upstairs that they are to increase fares as a *quid pro quo* for cancelling this very agreement, this very subsidy which he denounced. . . . The right hon. gentleman, brought here at the head of a great Ministry, and supposed to have a wonderful grasp of finance, actually proposed seriously to Parliament that they shall compound for a debt of £1,000,000 from the Treasury by imposing on the poor travelling in London £4,500,000 in perpetuity. That is the proposal. . . . The Bill now before the House, except for two formal clauses, is an entirely new Bill. Even the preamble has been amended by the Ministry of Transport. During the five weeks of the adjournment the Minister of Transport sent for the promoters. It was not a question of asking the Committee to consider new Clauses, or of asking the promoters to draw up new Clauses. The Minister actually re-drafted the whole thing. . . . The promotors handed to all the opponents what they themselves called a substituted Bill . . . so that you have every simple operative Clause in the Bill embodying the principle of which the House approved on Second Reading, thrown over and substituted by the new Bill from the Minister of Transport."

Lawyers Agree.

Clement Edwards further stated that all the lawyers engaged, both to support and oppose the Bill (they have lawyers to argue these matters in such committees), acted ont he suggestion that, as the Minister would fix the fares, it would be a waste of time to go into the question of fares there."

Increased Fares Mean 4·9 Extra Dividend.

Mr. Kennedy Jones observed that Lord Ashfield had admitted that the increased fares this year will yield £6,629,000. When all increased costs have been deducted, that will leave a net balance of £2,639,000, and after deducting rentals, renewals, reserves, etc., will leave £840,00 for ordinary stocks and shares, or 4.9 per cent. on the ordinary stocks at their face value. This is on Lord Ashfield's own estimate: actually, the profit is doubtless greater.

This Bill is promoted by four companies representing a combine of seventeen companies. The controlling company is the Underground Electric Company, which has four directors, Lord Ashfield, Mr. W. A. Burton, Mr. W. M. Acworth, and Mr. H. A. Vernet, who was Paper Controller during the War. These men control the distribution of the profits and are associated with omnibus and tram companies and will pull the strings in order that 'bus and tram fares may also be raised.

Slavish Members of Parliament.

The case put up by the opponents of the Bill was by no means shaken, but the proposal to re-commit the Bill was defeated by 184 votes to 92. 21 Labour Members voted against the Bill, and James Parker, still classed as a Labour Member, voted for it.

Capitalists Direct Control of Government.

This Bill strikingly shows how capitalist interests directly control the Government, and what a mere cipher the House of Commons has become. The Members of Parliament do not resent their humiliating position because they are soulless Party hacks, and know that without the support of their Party, which is controlled by the great capitalists, they would lose their seats.

What is J. H. Thomas Doing in This.

But what has become of the *Herald* yarn about the righteous Transport Minister? And who misinformed the *Daily Herald*? Was it J. H. Thomas? And why is he supporting Sir Eric Geddes? N.U.R. members should look into this!

THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

TRAFALGAR SQUARE MEETING

On Sunday 25th July, at 3.30 p.m.

(See Next Issue for Names of Speakers).

To Welcome the Ex-Service Men Marching from Bristol.

SOUTH WALES NOTES.

Housing Bonds.

To prove that the anti-Housing Bond Campaign has not been a movement of a few agitators, the Ferndale Lodge of the S.W.M.F. decided recently to take a ballot of its members. The form of ballot paper was such that every individual could understand the issue at stake. The result of the ballot shows a growth of class-conscious intelligence that is amazing. 1,800 men signified their disapproval of the Housing Bond Scheme, whilst only 500 were prepared to support.

As readers of the *Dreadnought* are aware, one of the Councillors (unfortunately, since deceased), sponsored by the Ferndale Lodge, resigned owing to the opposition of the Lodge to the Housing Bond Scheme, and his refusal to carry out the wishes of the Lodge.

Ferndale Lodge Stops Disobedient Councillor's Pay.

The other Councillor for whom the Ferndale Lodge is financially responsible is Abel Jacob, who, apart from being a J.P., is also chairman of the Rhondda Urban District Council. This man, although paid by the workmen, refused to accept any mandate from them. Even after the ballot upon the Housing Bonds question, he declared his intention to support the scheme of loans. Action of this sort cannot be tolerated to-day in the South Wales coalfield, more especially so in a progressive lodge like the one at Ferndale, and retribution has been swift.

Two mass meetings of the men were held; one for day-shift men, and one for night-shift men: at each meeting the following resolution was carried:—

"That this, the Ferndale Lodge of the S.W.M.F., having regard to the refusal of Councillor Abel Jacob, J.P., chairman of the R.U.D.C., to carry the definite instructions of the Lodge, to oppose the system of Housing Bonds, declines to take any further financial responsibility for him as an Urban District Councillor."

Rhondda Teachers.

The Rhondda teachers are still on the warpath and are likely to be seen in action shortly. For quite a considerable period, it is known, they have been negotiating with the R.U.D.C. in an endeavour to obtain increases in wages by peaceable means.

On several occasions rupture has seemed inevitable, owing to the attitude of the Council. The autocracy of these men to the employees of the Council is disgusting in view of the fact that the majority on the Council is composed of Labour representatives who are themselves workers. The gross indignities they force upon the teachers are of such a nature that they know their own organisation, the S.W.M.F., would not tolerate them for one moment. Nevertheless, they continue, and at the last meeting the teachers had with the Council, the bogey of bankruptcy was raised to frighten the teachers.

Seeing this had apparently no effect, the Coucillors sudden realised that, after all, they were merely representatives, and stated that before they could concede the demands of the teachers they would have to return to their constituencies.

This, as the teachers point out, would be equivalent to, and only comparable with, asking the consumers of coal if an increase in wages should be granted to the miners. Such a scheme of things is preposterous, yet miners, who are miners' representatives, have the audacity to make such suggestions to another body of workers.

Councillor Jacob's position at the present time should be a warning to these individuals, and should assist them to remember that their point of view should always be that of the worker, and in the event of their being unable to carry on within the confines of the present system, their duty is to return to the workers and tell them so. In this way they would become worthy of the confidence placed in them, and would help to stimulate revolutionary thought and action.

The Blind.

The position of the blind people in the Rhondda has long been a source of regret to every humane person. Thousands of pounds have been contributed by the miners to various institutions for the blind, yet nothing has been done to alleviate the condition of the local blind. This has caused great heart-burning amongst the blind, and those individuals who have been impressed with the apparent work done for the blind by St. Dunstan's, would do well to get amongst the blind of South Wales and ask them for their opinion. These people regard St. Dunstan's not as their benefactor, but as the enemy of the blind.

Much talk is heard of a conference of the blind held at the Clothmakers' Hall, London, a few months ago, when Sir A. Pearson, on behalf of St. Dunstan's, was asked to give the receipts side of the St. Dunstan's balance sheet. This, we are told, was refused point blank, and all the conference was given was the expenditure of the institution. Rumours are abroad that millions of pounds are invested in War stock on behalf of St. Dunstan's, whilst all over the country blind people are working for ridiculously low wages or exist by begging.

Steps are being taken in South Wales to eradicate these evil conditions. A South Wales Council for the Blind is being formed, the object of which is to build workshops for those who can work, and to make comfortable the life of those who cannot. Control is to be shared equally between the blind people's organisation, other trade unions who help to support the blind, and representatives of the various institutions of the blind that will be built.

Although the scheme is not quite as democratic as some would like it to be, it cannot be denied that it indicates progress, inasmuch as the blind people, in the past, have been allowed no voice at all in the management of the own affairs.

THE BENEFITS OF THE S.W.M.F.

In my last article I showed clearly the increased activities of the S.W.M.F., especially in the direction of education. Our organisation is moving on entirely new lines, and is recognising the evolution of industry.

The S.W.M.F. is a revolutionary organisation; we are out to use all means possible to abolish capitalism. Thousands of our members still look upon the S.W.M.F. as a financial investment; hence the need for education on Communist lines.

We desire our members to understand the identity of interests between the miners of England, Scotland and Wales. We desire to foster the spirit of Internationalism.

We are only a small fraction of the working class, hence the necessity for a closer union with other organisations. Being a Communist, and therefore an industrial unionist, I advocate the strengthening of the M.F.G.B. to unite the whole of the mining industry.

Then there is the International Miners' Movement, to which we must pay far more attention than in the past. To obtain the solidarity of the workers of the world we must unite the miners nationally and internationally. That some districts are more revolutionary than others, only proves the necessity for more extensive education and propaganda. The Miners' International has been re-formed and meets in Geneva next August. I have been appointed an official delegate from the M.F.G.B. to that conference.

To quote Plekhanof, the Labour movement must become the midwife of the new society, the embryo of which the existing capitalist society carries in its womb. In this character we have to study the mechanism of birth and find out how best it can be accomplished.

Comrades, with such great issues before us, do not let us quibble over a 1s. weekly contribution to the S.W.M.F.

A. J. COOK.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE EX-SERVICEMEN.

A Bristol Development.

The International Union of Ex-Servicemen is an exceedingly active body, which is rallying to its ranks thousands of workless and disappointed ex-soldiers, who to-day are walking the streets of Bristol, animated by a growing bitterness. The "Comrades of the Great War," that fabrication of Jingo-Toryism, has outlived its brief popularity and no longer counts. The Liberal "Federation of Discharged and Demobilised Soldiers and Sailors" has also passed its waxing time and is daily losing its membership to the militant International Union.

Bristol Ex-Servicemen who had been tram conductors before the war, found themselves unemployed and saw girls on the trams in their places. They smashed the trams in an impulse of fury. But this is not typical of the Union's activities; as a rule its action is clearly directed against the Government, the employer, or the landlord. In smashing the trams, its members were acting inadvertently, also against the girls.

In the disturbances of the day, an Ex-Serviceman was arrested. In protest a bomb was thrown at the gates of the prison. The act was probably unofficial, but it was symptomatic of the feeling that is gathering around the standard raised by the organisation. In the course of one disturbance a revolver shop was broken into.

The windows of Bristol Labour Exchanges have been smashed, because the Exchanges are regarded as a sham.

Whilst a Bristol Ex-Serviceman was in Bath the landlord gave his wife and children notice to quit. They could find no other house. To induce them to leave, the landlord cut off the gas and water, then finally evicted them by force, though he had not procured an order of the Court.

The case was brought to the International Union. The Union decided to seek legal redress for the evicted family, but it also sent a party of its members to deal directly with the landlord.

Damage done to the property of other oppressive landlords had taught the authorities what to expect, and 70 policemen were on guard to protect the landlord. All night long the landlord was terrified by police whistles blowing from this direction and that and by seeing the police go rushing helter-skelter after the ex-soldiers they never succeeded in catching.

A negro earning £1 a week, with a wife and four children to maintain, was imprisoned for failure to pay 2s. 6d. a week for a child in an industrial school. The Ex-Servicemen, hearing of his case, decided to pay the fine.

Women, often bringing their children, come to the Union with all sorts of grievances. Sometimes it is a hire-purchase company which has seized their furniture because their payments are in arrears. In such cases the Union negotiates with the Company, and there is always the menace that the shop may be wrecked unless the furniture is restored.

On July 5th the Union seized an empty house and installed a war-widow and two children therein.

A "no rent" campaign has been inaugurated.

The Union is sending some of its members to march to London to get into touch with like elements there and to focuse the opinion of the people upon its rebellious discontent.

A meeting will be held in every village on the way.

The marchers will leave Bristol on July 14th and reach London on July 25th.

BETWEEN OURSELVES.

By L. A. MOTLER.

It is the fashion—in fact, it has long been the fashion for the penny morning pifflers to have a real live militarist write an occasional column on things military. So of course, the *Herald*, which tries its hardest to camouflage itself like unto its unfortunate sisters of the street (of ink, and another word that rhymes therewith), also has its pet militarist. He is kept in the back-yard, no doubt, and fed every morning on shredded wheat in an effort to pacifise him, to use a new word. And on great occasions, as when a book by a fellow militarist is published, he is led to the office boy's den and given a pen and some ink to play with.

On the present occasion somebody with the unpronounceable name of Tuohy has been tracking down our secret service (now known at all music-halls as M.I.5.), and he has collected enough to put in between a nice cover labelled *The Secret Corps*. Perhaps fellow-worker Tuohy is a descendant of George Washington, but it does seem peculiar that the Secret Corps should be unable to keep its secrets from Tuohy. But, anyway, here is the book in the hands of Major H. J. Gillespie, D.S.O.

The gallant Major tells us in a few crisp military lines what the book is about. "All the world loves a detective story," he begins and you wonder how he came by this original thought. However, this is not all. Having made a good start at making your flesh creep, he has recourse to another brilliant piece of imagination. He says: "All England, here and over the water, has, sometime or other during the five years, had the spy mania." Unfortunately for the Major, it isn't true, but you can hardly blame him for not being able to keep track of all England, here and over the water, whilst he has been (presumably) killing Germans as fast as he could in obedience to the behest of that meek and lowly Christian, Father Bernard Vaughan—who himself did most of his killing from the pulpit. Even Bernard Vaughan himself, let alone a certain bearded gentleman in charge of the Kingdom of Upstairs, cannot be in two places at once, not even in "England, here and over the water," wherever that may be.

However, to the book. Our comrade of the D.S.O. says: "It tells of Englishmen on German Army staffs; of Grecian girls trained as prostitute spies; of peasants signalling with windmills; of faked intelligence, and of the double-cross." Yes, and the Major doesn't turn a hair. He has no nasty smack to handle out to old Venizelos. Ours, apparently, according to the gallant Major, was not to reason why, ours but to do and spy, for he continues:—

"On the whole, OUR Intelligence seems to have been at least just as good, if not much better, than that of any other nation;" (and you'll have to excuse his grammar; the sword being more in his line than the pen.) "But," he concludes, "in the Secret Service, as in every other, WE WON in spite of the blockheaded, tapebound, stupidity of those who had forgotten the maxims of Napoleon and made war according to the minutes of Whitehall."

And please note that the large type is mine; I make the Major a present of it, no extra charge—and that is not to be sneezed at these days, when printing costs are up by about 800 per cent.

However, the Major has earned it, for he is one of those rare fellows who believe that WE, meaning you and me, Henry, won the War. Observe how sorrowfully he rages at Whitehall for not running the War according to the maxims of Napoleon. Nothing about the War being a capitalist War; an engineers' War; a War to end war; a fight for justice, freedom, and honour; a War for the liberation of small nations, except Ireland; a struggle between the minions of brimstone and treacle and the angels of light, gas, coal and iron.

No; what makes the Major so sad is not the spectacle of Grecian girls being trained as prostitute spies (do they use majors or brigadier-generals as trainers, say?), nor the windmills putting the double-cross on the Germans on the English Army staffs. It is solely the harrowing thought that the War office refused to use the maxims laid down by Napoleon and Major Gillespie.

But there is one comforting thought about it all; we have a real live Major telling us in the columns of a Labour daily that, in spite of a.. that, WE WON THE WAR.

Perhaps the *Herald* had better send the Major to the Spa Conference to win the Peace for us—according to the maxims of Napoleon. And if maxims won't do, then have a try with the Lewis guns.

CONSCRIPTION IN NEW ZEALAND.

Military service for the boys of New Zealand is enforced with unabated severity. In one day recently 70 boys were brought into Court under the Territorial Act for failure to drill. In the majority of cases the fine was £5 and costs. Three lads were respectively 30s, 30s., and 40s., an entire week's wages in each case. A boy of 15 was fined 10s. for interrupting a parade. The low wages earned by the lads makes the £5 imposed in most of the cases a crushing burden. Some said they were stable boys and had missed drills because they were attending country race meetings, but the excuse did not save them. One boy who had missed 18 parades, had been working overtime, but he was fined £5.

POSTPONED FROM JULY 4th.

GARDEN PARTY AT FEDERATION HOUSE

George Lane, South Woodford.

(George Lane, on the G.E.R. from Liverpool Street; or by No. 10A 'bus from the Monument down Mile End Road).

Sunday, July 18th, from 3 to 10 p.m.

Entrance One Shilling. Refreshments.

COMMUNIST PARTY

British Section of the Third International.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.—The acceptance of the following points: (1) The complete overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. (2) The Class struggle. (3) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (4) The Soviet or Revolutionary Workers' Council system. (5) Affiliation to the Third International. (6) Refusal to engage in Parliamentary Action. (7) Non-affiliation to the Labour Party.

MINIMUM WEEKLY SUBSCRIPTION: Threepence.

Provisional Secretary: EDGAR T. WHITEHEAD, 8, Sinclair Gardens, West Kensington, London, W.14.

Branches' notes and list of meetings, sent in for publication, should reach the Secretary not later than first post Monday morning.—All articles and news matter (other than Branches' notes) to be sent to: 400, Old Ford Road, Bow, London, E.3. and marked: "The Editor, The Workers' Dreadnought."

The "WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT" may be obtained for sale at 3/-per quire (26 copies). Usual Trade rates for wholesale and retail newsagents.

All Members should make a special effort to see that our paper is on sale and posters displayed at local newsagents, trade union branches, in the workshop and at all public meetings in their districts.

LONDON MEETINGS: OUTDOOR.

Friday, July 16th. Manor Park Road, near Willesden Junction Station, 7.30 p.m. T. Bromage, Pyzer.

Saturday, July 17th. Acton Market Place, 3 p.m. Minnie Birch, Wm. Leslie, Melvina Walker and others.

7.30. p.m. Janet Grove, Wm. Leslie, Melvina Walker and others.

Sunday, July 18th, Osborn Street, Whitechapel, 11.45 a.m. Melvina Walker and others.

Victoria Park, 12| (noon). Walter Ponder and others.

Dock Gates, Poplar, 7.30 p.m. Com. Joy, Councillor Siffleet, Melvina Walker.

Federation House, Woodford, 3-10 p.m., Outing. (See advertisement).

Monday, July 19th Whitburn Road, Lewisham, 7.30 p.m. Jack Sullivan, Melvina Walker.

Wednesday, July 21st. Wren Road, Camberwell, 7.30 p.m. Clara Cole, David Maguire.

Friday, July 23rd. Manor Park Road, near Willesden Junction Station, 7.30 p.m. Wm. Leslie and others.

Sunday, July 25th. Meeting at Trafalgar Square at 3.30 p.m. (See next issue for names of speakers).

INDOOR.

Monday, July 19th. 20, Railway Street, Poplar, 8 p.m. Educational Class.

16, Peckham Road, 7.30 p.m., Committee Meeting, Camberwell C.P.

Thursday, July 22nd. 20, Railway Street, Poplar, 8 p.m. Speakers' Class.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

EAST LONDON WORKERS' COMMITTEE.

Thursday, July 22nd, International Socialist Club, 28, East Road, City Road, 7.30 p.m. Business Meeting.

WALTHAMSTOW LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.

Tuesday, July 20th, William Morris Hall, Somers Road, 3 p.m. Mrs. Christy and others.

COMMUNIST PARTY NOTES.

J. Harold, secretary of the Gorton Socialist Fellowship, writes to say that his membership is now completely absorbed in the Communist Party. The branch sends a donation of £5.

A. Durham, of the Co-operative Lands and Crafts' Guild, Holt, Norfolk, writes that a branch of the Communist Party is now formed, and repeats his order for two quire of *Dreadnoughts*.

CAMBERWELL.

At a Branch meeting on Monday, July 5th, two new members joined. It was decided to try to take a small shop for the sale of literature and articles made on Communist Saturdays. Branch meetings, Mondays, at 8 p.m., at 16, Peckham Road; outdoor meetings, Wednesdays, at 7.30, at Wren Road.

Appeal for One Thousand Guarantors.

Comrades,—Our aim is to weld all revolutionary Communist elements in the country into one solidly-knit organisation, to forge a revolutionary core for the coming crisis.

This work is vital for the triumph of Communism. Our need for funds in this task is large. District Conferences have to be held, Communist Organisers sent to the provinces, and full preparations made for the conference of the party in September.

In order therefore to relieve the organisation of financial difficulty during this vital period, we appeal for ONE THOUSAND COMRADES to give a weekly sum of ONE SHILLING for a period of THREE MONTHS. Contributions should be sent to the Treasurer, PERCY WALLIS, 18, Angel Road; Hammersmith, London, W.6.

GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED.

G. W. Aird, 5s.; Roodzant, 2s. 6d.; Manchester S.S. Communist Saturday Effort, 19s.; Holt Communists (profit on literature sales), 3s. 2d.; Poplar Branch Communist Saturday, £1; P. Solovitch, 5s.; Alfred Holdsworth, £2; F. Petrie, 3s.; two Communists, 26s.

COMRADES IN COUNCIL.—AN OPEN TRIBUNE.

[Correspondence is invited on the Programme of the Communist Party preparatory to the National Conference, to be held in Manchester in September. We hope that correspondents will devote themselves as far as possible to make constructive suggestions, all of which will be passed on to the Agenda Committee. In view of the existing need for a vigorous conservation of space, the Editor reserves the right of printing only extracts deemed essential to the point under discussion.]

The Communist Party and Workers' Committees.

Dear Editor,—Having attended the Communist Conference, held in the premises of the International Socialist Club, I can safely lay before my Northern comrades in the City of Aberdeen a definite Communist and anti-Parliamentarian programme.

I represented my comrades by proxy, and when the constitution is framed, I desire that it be sent North for their consideration immediately with a view to joining the Communist Party.

My real objections to the formation of "Workers' Committees" (shared also by the Aberdeen Group) being part of the Communist programme, is the palliative nature of the various sections affiliated to the district or central committees. The programme of the Scottish Workers' Committee, Glasgow, cannot become part of the revolutionary class struggle, owing to the fact that its component parts represent sections of the Labour Movement, which are still part of the Second International. It has no spine, it may be embryonic, yet its body can be bent and twisted by opportunists of a very dangerous character. We Communists cannot overlook the actions of Lieber, Dan, Tseretelli, etc., who ran for eight months a Menshevik Soviet system for their own opportunistic aims.

The Committees must have a clear, definite, revolutionary programme to put before the workers in the various industries. It must be made plain to the workers of every department in a big industry that their first aim is to educate themselves to their class position; to organise by industry as against craft lines; to point out to them that wage-slavery must be abolished and that the ultimate aim is to prepare for the final struggle with their masters by relieving them of the management of industry. The common propaganda by certain social revolutionaries in those committees is to put forward wage-raising resolutions, shop reforms, and a host of other palliatives, which they say are good tactics. Every workshop should have a committee built on lines of no compromise with the master-class.

The Soviet or Committee system must come under the dictatorship of the Communist Party, and a firm hand should be kept above the vacillating Menshevik persons and committees, such as you have in Britain. The least rope given to the parties in Soviet Russia who come under Communist surveillance would be the betrayal of "All Power to the Soviets." Many of the traitors sneaked back from Koltchak's iron rule to be received coldly by the Communist Party of Russia. They could work on condition that they obeyed the dictatorship, yet suspicions are aroused in them of a dangerous kind, hence the strict watchfulness of the Bolsheviki of such dangerous creatures. Keep an eye on our Kautzkys and Plekhanoffs, and make our fight a clear straight issue for the complete overthrow of bourgeois society.—W. LESLIE, Aberdeen Communist Group.

Payment by Results.

Dear Editor,—Following the lead of the A.S.E., the South Wales Miners' Federation, at its half-yearly conference, has decided by a big majority to ballot on the abolition of piece rates, or payment by results. There is no doubt in my mind as to the result. I expect a big majority in favour of abolition."

What will the effects of the change be, economically? Will the workers, as well as the employers, be affected by the altered means of production, which will certainly be the means of bringing about a decrease in output?

As a piece-worker, I am fully alive to the nasty incentive we have before us daily, which has for generations been the means of demoralising the finer man to such an extent that to-day we find ourselves a disgrace to our primitive brothers of the by-gone ages. The piece-worker has but one thought—output; he disregards the sacrifice made in health and life and limb.

Will that selfish side of our nature glide into oblivion when "payment by results" is no more? My answer is: "It will not!" When we have established a decent daily wage, you will find that the brute is alive, and as strong as ever, and will remain for some time, and men will refuse to do what some people regard as a decent day's work because they will not benefit personally one fraction by it, whether they fill a ton of coal or not.

With that spirit prevailing we are faced in the near future with a big decrease in the coal output.

I welcome the opinions of my friends through these columns as to whether the changed methods of employment under the present existing order of things will be to our detriment or our benefit.—Yours fraternally, CHAS. ROBERTS.

Brynwyth.

Printed at the AGENDA PRESS (T.U.), 10, Wine Office Court, London, E.C.4, and Published by the Communist Party at 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.